

work in eradicating the pink bollworm; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5714. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of 49 citizens of Epping, N. Dak., protesting against any change in the immigration laws which would reduce the quotas from the northern countries of Europe; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5715. By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition from citizens of Yuma County, Colo., in behalf of the National Tribune's Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5716. Also, petition signed by residents of Fort Collins, Colo., in behalf of the National Tribune's Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5717. By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Petition of J. A. Francis and citizens of Ross County, Ohio, urging increases of pensions for Civil War soldiers and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5718. Also, petition of Anna Litten and citizens of Asheville, Ohio, urging increases of pensions for Civil War soldiers and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5719. Also, petition of J. F. Thompson and citizens of Bremen, Ohio, urging increases of pensions for Civil War soldiers and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5720. By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: Petition of residents of the eighth congressional district of Michigan, urging more liberal pension legislation for veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5721. Also, petition of residents of the eighth congressional district of Michigan, protesting against the passage of compulsory Sunday observance legislation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5722. By Mr. WEAVER: Petition of citizens of Asheville, N. C., protesting against House bill 78, Lankford Sunday observance law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5723. By Mr. WHITE of Colorado: Letter of John E. Gross, secretary-treasurer Colorado State Federation of Labor, approving the Box-Harris bills for the restriction of immigration from Mexico; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5724. By Mr. WINGO: Petitions of citizens of Uniontown, Driggs, and Chismville, Ark., indorsing legislation for increase in pension for veterans of the Civil War and their widows; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5725. By Mr. WILLIAMS of Missouri: Petition of E. L. Newman et al., urging the passage of the National Tribune's Civil War pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

5726. By Mr. WINTER: Petition for Civil War pensions, by citizens of Medicine Bow, Wyo.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

5727. By Mr. YON: Petition of J. H. Pippin and 81 other citizens of Jackson County, Fla., urging Congress to increase the pensions of the veterans of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, March 21, 1928

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 20, 1928)

The Senate reassembled at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. MOSES). The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7191. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land in Cook County, Ill., to the Chicago & Western Indiana Railroad Co., its successors or assigns, under certain conditions;

H. R. 10540. An act to credit retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard with active duty during the World War performed since retirement; and

H. R. 11022. An act to extend medical and hospital relief to retired officers and enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 3. An act for the relief of Kate Mathews; and

H. R. 5500. An act to establish a national military park at the battle field of Fort Donelson, Tenn.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll. The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Edwards	Keyes	Schall
Barkley	Fess	King	Sheppard
Bayard	Fletcher	La Follette	Shortridge
Bingham	Frazier	McKellar	Smith
Black	George	McLean	Smoot
Blaine	Gerry	McMaster	Steck
Blease	Gillett	McNary	Stelwer
Borah	Glass	Mayfield	Stephens
Bratton	Gooding	Metcalf	Swanson
Brookhart	Gould	Moses	Tydings
Broussard	Greene	Neely	Tyson
Bruce	Hale	Norbeck	Wagner
Capper	Harris	Nye	Walsh, Mass.
Caraway	Harrison	Overman	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Hawes	Phipps	Warren
Couzens	Hayden	Pittman	Waterman
Curtis	Heflin	Ransdell	Watson
Cutting	Howell	Reed, Mo.	Wheeler
Deneen	Johnson	Reed, Pa.	Willis
Dill	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	
Edge	Kendrick	Sackett	

Mr. JONES. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] are detained in committee.

Mr. GERRY. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is necessarily detained on official business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

HORTICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION, CHEYENNE, WYO. (S. DOC. NO. 76)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture, amounting to \$100,000, for the fiscal year 1929, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act providing for horticultural experiment and demonstration work in the semi-arid or dry-land regions of the United States," approved March 19, 1928, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 7191. An act to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to convey certain land in Cook County, Ill., to the Chicago & Western Indiana Railroad Co., its successors or assigns, under certain conditions;

H. R. 10540. An act to credit retired commissioned officers of the Coast Guard with active duty during the World War performed since retirement; and

H. R. 11022. An act to extend medical and hospital relief to retired officers and enlisted men of the United States Coast Guard.

TAX REDUCTION

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have been requested by a number of Senators to give notice as early as possible when the Finance Committee will begin consideration of the revenue bill as sent to us from the House. I desire to give notice now, so that members of the committee can arrange their affairs, that we expect to begin the consideration of the revenue bill on Tuesday, April 3, at 10 o'clock.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, may I ask if it is proposed to hold hearings?

Mr. SMOOT. That, of course, the committee itself will have to decide. I will state, however, that at the first meeting we will have present a representative from the Treasury Department with the latest statistics as to the amount of income received this year as compared with a year ago.

Mr. COUZENS. I would like to ask the chairman if he thinks that the committee is going to hold hearings? There are several provisions of the bill on which hearings ought to be held and ample notice ought to be given to persons who desire to appear, if that is to be done.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I have not discussed it with any members of the committee. If there is any member of the committee who desires hearings, I am quite sure the request will be granted.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator if he does not think it possible to call a meeting of the committee before that time to determine whether or not we are going to have hearings and how long the hearings are going to take? Of course I and other members of the committee are interested, at

least I am sure Senators on this side of the aisle are, if it shall be necessary to have hearings, to expedite them as much as possible so that we may have the bill reported out and get some tax-relief legislation at this session.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I have not any doubt that we will have tax-relief legislation during this session of Congress. I will also say that there have been few requests coming to me as chairman of the committee for hearings on the bill. I might add also for the information of the Senator that there are only about three items in the bill concerning which I have heard any complaint at all.

Mr. HARRISON. Then it is the Senator's opinion that it is not necessary to have prolonged hearings on the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite sure that it is not. For instance, I will say to the Senator that the question of the valuation of 1913 is the point with reference to which I have had more complaint as to the House provision than with reference to any other provision in the bill. The next one that amounts to anything has reference to section 220. Of course, the Senator knows what it is. It is a very difficult piece of legislation. The House has changed it entirely. If I were to express my own opinion, I would say that I think the changed provision as adopted by the House is even more complicated than section 220 of the existing law. Those are the only two subjects about which I have received letters.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope the hearings will not be long, so that we may get the bill reported out promptly.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts presented a petition of sundry citizens of Jamaica Plain, Framingham Center, Roxbury, and Swampscott, Mass., also of a large number of citizens of Massachusetts individually, praying for the prompt passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARREN presented a resolution adopted by the Cody Club, of Cody, Wyo., favoring the making of increased appropriations for construction of designated highways in Federal reservations, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BARKLEY presented a petition of sundry citizens of Louisville, Ky., praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COPELAND presented a petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn and vicinity, in the State of New York, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War Veterans and their widows, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILLIS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Cleveland and vicinity, in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of legislation granting increased pensions to Civil War veterans and their widows, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. EDGE presented a letter in the nature of a petition from Winfield S. Price, mayor of Camden, N. J., relative to naval shipbuilding, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,
Camden, N. J., March 20, 1928.

HON. WALTER E. EDGE,

Senator, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR EDGE: I have noted with considerable regret that when the Navy appropriation bill passed the House of Representatives that it contained an amendment by Mr. DALLINGER, of Massachusetts, providing that one-half the ships authorized must be constructed in Government navy yards.

My opinion in this is that it is a serious matter, and the amendment should be eliminated from the bill before it is passed by the Senate. If the Government is going to construct half of its ships in Government navy yards, it will result in a few more years in the practical elimination of all privately owned shipbuilding industries in this country. As you perhaps know, there are but about three shipyards left in the United States to-day, and it seems only fair that if these industries are to continue in business that they must be given practically all of the new construction of naval vessels that may be authorized by the United States Government in order that they may be kept alive and available for the construction of ships in the event of the occurrence of another major emergency similar to that with which we were confronted in 1917.

Very truly yours,

WINFIELD S. PRICE, Mayor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana, from the Committee on Pensions, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 4115. An act for the relief of Winfield Scott (Rept. No. 597);

H. R. 4116. An act for the relief of W. Laurence Hazard (Rept. No. 599); and

H. R. 4117. An act for the relief of Harriet K. Carey (Rept. No. 598).

Mr. BORAH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 211) to amend Public Resolution 65, approved March 3, 1925, authorizing the participation of the United States Government in the international exposition to be held in Seville, Spain, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BORAH. As in executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I submit a report for the calendar on an executive matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEIWER in the chair). The report will be received and will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

SENATOR FROM MAINE

Mr. SHORTRIDGE, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported a resolution (S. Res. 174), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1927, contingent fund of the Senate, to Hon. ARTHUR R. GOULD, a Senator from the State of Maine, \$10,906.04, in full reimbursement for all expenses incurred, including fees and expenses of his attorneys, in defending charges made against him and ordered to be investigated by S. Res. 296, agreed to January 3, 1927.

SENATOR FROM IOWA

Mr. SHORTRIDGE, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported a resolution (S. Res. 175), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to pay from the appropriation for expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1927, contingent fund of the Senate, to Hon. SMITH W. BROOKHART, a Senator from the State of Iowa, \$1,725, balance in full reimbursement for all expenses incurred in defense of his right to a seat in the Senate resulting from the contest of the 1924 election of a Senator from the State of Iowa.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on this day that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 3) for the relief of Kate Mathews.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WATSON:

A bill (S. 3709) to provide a code of insurance law for the District of Columbia, except as herein provided, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BAYARD:

A bill (S. 3710) for the relief of the Cosulich Società Triestina di Navigazione, an Italian corporation, with its principal office at Trieste, and before the war known as the Austro-American Line; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts:

A bill (S. 3711) for the relief of F. E. Merrill; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3712) granting an increase of pension to Mary H. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDELL:

A bill (S. 3713) granting an increase of pension to Florence R. Downey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON:

A bill (S. 3714) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BARKLEY:

A bill (S. 3715) to remove the charge of desertion from the records of George W. Goldsby; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

A bill (S. 3716) granting an increase of pension to Maria Dean (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3717) granting an increase of pension to Eva M. McColey;

A bill (S. 3718) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Bowden (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3719) granting an increase of pension to Caroline S. Masters (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3720) granting a pension to John L. Wyskiver (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A bill (S. 3721) to establish the office of captain of the port of New York and to define his duties; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. REED of Missouri:

A bill (S. 3722) granting a pension to Jennie Glass (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EDGE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) authorizing an investigation and survey for a Nicaraguan canal; to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 118) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to cooperate with the other relief creditor governments in making it possible for Austria to float a loan in order to obtain funds for the furtherance of its reconstruction program, and to conclude an agreement for the settlement of the indebtedness of Austria to the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

FORTY-FOUR HOUR WEEK FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3116) providing for half holidays for certain Government employees, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CLAIMS OF SETTLERS, LAKE COUNTY, FLA.

Mr. FLETCHER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5695) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to equitably adjust disputes and claims of settlers and others against the United States and between each other arising from incomplete or faulty surveys in township 19 south, range 26 east, and in sections 7, 8, 17, 18, 19, 30, 31, township 19 south, range 27 east, Tallahassee meridian, Lake County, in the State of Florida, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NAVAL BUILDING PROGRAM

Mr. SCHALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from W. V. Brandt, of Germantown, Pa., relative to the naval building program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A VETERAN'S PLEA FOR THE NAVY

HON. THOMAS D. SCHALL,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR SCHALL: Every veteran of the World War has engraved upon his memory incidents which time can never erase. Some of these are pleasant memories, and one such which I shall never forget is that of my meeting with you and your charming wife on board the U. S. S. *Mount Vernon* immediately following our engagement with a German submarine upon the high seas 250 miles west of Brest.

On the morning of September 5, 1918, I had been on duty in our after gunnery-control station for the morning watch from 4 to 8 a. m. At 7.53 our ship was torpedoed by a German submarine. At the time I was very busy directing the fire of our stern guns and the dropping of depth bombs, at which duty I was kept busy until relieved just before 9 o'clock. As I came down out of the control station there is engraved upon my memory a picture of you and your brave little wife standing on our boat deck, calm and collected, while Mrs. Schall kept you advised of all that was going on. This picture of a brave American woman standing by the side of her husband upon the deck of a sinking ship, with a poise and bearing as if she were in the drawing room of her own home, so impressed me that it has ever been one of the most pleasant memories of my entire war experience.

I had always intended during the years that have passed since the dark days of 1918 of calling upon you to renew our brief acquaintance, but I have never had this opportunity; but, as I know from my conversation with you aboard the *Mount Vernon* that you are a friend of the Navy, I am taking the liberty of addressing this letter to you at this time when, in my opinion, the Navy needs all of its friends.

As you know, the Navy Department recently submitted to Congress a bill providing for the construction of certain auxiliary ships which, in the opinion of the General Board of the Navy, are needed to enable our country to maintain a well-balanced, coordinated fleet for its protection. Unfortunately this bill has been greatly reduced in

the House, and as it will soon be before the Senate I am taking the liberty of writing you in hopes that the original program, as requested by the Navy Department, will receive more favorable consideration in the Senate.

From my experience in the Navy (in which I have served as a midshipman at the Naval Academy, and as an ensign and Lieutenant in submarine and transport service during the World War) and from a study of the situation, inspired by a life-long interest in the naval service, I know that we do not, at the present time, have a first-class, well-balanced, coordinated Navy. While we are permitted by a treaty to have 18 first-class battleships, we are lacking in auxiliary ships, and 18 battleships without sufficient cruisers, submarines, aircraft carriers, and destroyer leaders, to scout ahead and form a protective screen around them, are, in my opinion, 18 doomed ships.

The Navy Department has determined, by a careful study, the number of auxiliary ships which our Navy needs in order to round out its fleet, and I am convinced that without these necessary auxiliary ships we will not have a first-class, well-balanced Navy, and the vital interests of this country, in my opinion, necessitate that we maintain a first-class Navy.

Our country is no longer isolated from the rest of the world, and while we have earnestly endeavored to keep out of entangling alliances, developments in other parts of the world have their effect upon this Nation. Until all the major powers of the world agree to disarm and settle international disputes by arbitration, there is always the possibility of war. It is, therefore, in my opinion, good judgment to have this Nation always prepared to defend its vital interests.

Situated as we are, any power which might seek to injure us must do it by way of the sea. Our Navy is, therefore, our first line of defense, and in the final analysis, our strength, our security, and our prosperity rest upon our Navy.

It is, in my opinion, particularly unfortunate that no provision was made in the bill as passed by the House for submarines. As a graduate of the Navy school for submarine officers, I firmly believe that there is no ship which can take the place of the submarine. It is one of the best defensive weapons yet devised for offshore defense of strategic and vital ports. As an advance scout, able to travel submerged and gain information regarding enemy movements and disposition, it is in a class entirely alone.

My dear Senator, do not think that because I am writing you in favor of our maintaining a strong Navy that I am an alarmist or that I believe in wars, for such is not the case. As a veteran of the late war, I have had the experience of seeing my shipmates blown to pieces around me. I have stood upon the deck of a ship and seen hardened Navy seamen, with years of experience, stand at attention with tears streaming down their faces as the mangled forms of our shipmates were brought from out of the hold below and over the topside.

A man who has passed through such experience is not an advocate of war. Furthermore, I have two splendid young sons, of whom I am very proud, and I hope that they may be spared the horrors of a war which I have seen. I am, therefore, not making this plea for a strong Navy under the belief that a strong Navy leads to war, but, on the contrary, I am making it under the firm belief that unpreparedness leads to war, while strength and power to defend the interests of this Nation will repel war and be a means of keeping us out of war.

It is the duty of Congress to provide and maintain the Navy of the United States, and I trust that in the fulfillment of its duty Congress will provide for our maintaining an adequate Navy, fully equipped and consisting of the necessary auxiliaries to protect our battleship fleet and the vital interests of this Nation.

I trust, my dear Senator, that you will consider this letter in the same friendly and kindly spirit with which it is written and as one coming from a patriotic American now in civil life, who is willing to fight now for the Navy just as sincerely and intensely as he fought with the Navy in the days of 1918, when the Nation needed a Navy and our Navy needed men.

Most sincerely yours,

W. VAN C. BRANDT,

71 Maplewood Avenue, Germantown, Pa.

TARIFF COMMISSION—INTERVIEW WITH ALFRED P. DENNIS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interview published in the *Baltimore Sun* of March 17, 1928, with Dr. Alfred P. Dennis, a member of the Tariff Commission, relating to conditions in that body.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENNIS IS HOPEFUL OVER TARIFF BODY—MARYLANDER SAYS IF HE WERE NOT HE WOULD HAVE QUIT WITH COSTIGAN—PREDICTS IMPROVEMENT—DEMOCRATIC MEMBER OF COMMISSION SAYS COOLIDGE IS TRYING TO IRON OUT TROUBLES

[Washington Bureau of the *The Sun*]

WASHINGTON, March 16.—Alfred P. Dennis, Democrat, of Maryland, asserted to-day that if it were not for his hope that something will be

done to correct conditions in the Tariff Commission he would follow the lead of Edward P. Costigan and resign.

He said, however, he was convinced President Coolidge desired to iron out the difficulties in the commission; that he believed the special investigating committee of Congress would recommend an adequate remedy, and that in view of this he hoped for a rehabilitation of the commission.

Mr. Dennis discussed the situation in the commission when he was questioned about a statement issued yesterday by Commissioner Edgar B. Brossard, Republican, of Utah, in which Mr. Brossard said that Mr. Costigan had resigned after he had failed completely to sustain his charges before the Senate committee and that Mr. Costigan had considered everybody out of step but himself.

Mr. Dennis took this as an implication that he had been joining with the Republican members of the commission against Mr. Costigan, Progressive Republican.

NO REFLECTION INTENDED

Mr. Brossard, however, maintained that he had meant to make no reflection on Mr. Dennis or his work on the commission.

"My statement was intended solely for Mr. Costigan, and it was directed at him because of the extreme charges he made against me in the statement given out when he resigned," Mr. Brossard said.

Mr. Dennis said he did not wish to be drawn into any public controversy now, and that he did not want to issue a formal statement. He said, however, that he considered that Mr. Brossard's criticism of Commissioner Costigan had carried with it an "unfortunate reflection" on the two Democratic members—himself and Commissioner Lincoln Dixon, of Indiana. He pointed out that the three Democrats had been in substantial agreement in recent cases sent by the commission to the President, including rag rugs, cherries, synthetic phenolic resin, and logs.

"The commission has been confronted with enormous difficulties in the administration of the law, difficulties which have been emphasized by the presence on the commission of members with political axes to grind," Mr. Dennis said.

COMMISSION "NOT ON LEVEL"

"I have repeatedly stated in public and again reiterate that the commission is not run on the level. We grind out cases here involving higher duties, but when it comes to lower duties we have done nothing outside of a few cases of despicable unimportance, such as paint-brush handles and live bobwhite quail.

"We have spent years in obtaining the facts in some of the important lower duty cases, the cost ranging from \$25,000 to \$75,000, only to have euthanasia decreed in the latter stages of the investigation by the special interests represented by the high protectionist wing of the commission.

EXPECTS IMPROVEMENT

"The flexible tariff is thus used as a cover to prevent the very things it was intended to do. Mr. Costigan, feeling that the case was hopeless for an impartial, scientific administration of the tariff act, has voluntarily sought retirement. I am not quite so hopeless about the situation as Mr. Costigan, since I think the attitude of the President is distinctly sympathetic to clearing up the difficulties which have embarrassed the commission.

"Something in the way of corrective measures can be expected also from the Senate committee, which is formulating a program for the rehabilitation of the Tariff Commission. But for the hope which I am expressing I would be compelled to straightway follow Mr. Costigan into retirement."

O. G. VILLARD

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, I present certain newspaper articles relative to recent dinners in honor of O. G. Villard, editor of the Nation, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD. In this connection I desire to call attention to previous insertions which appear on page 4159, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 5, 1928, and on page 4350, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 7, 1928.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Afro-American, Baltimore, Md., Saturday, March 17, 1928] BLEASE TELLS WHY HE READ AFRO ARTICLE INTO RECORD—ATTENDANCE OF TWO RACES AT DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA "NATION" DINNER TERMED EQUALITY—MRS. TERRELL, BROOKS, NEVAL THOMAS THERE—MANCE, WILKINSON, NAMED AS SOUTHERNERS WHO SUPPORT HIS VIEWS

By Louis R. Lautier

WASHINGTON, D. C.—"The people of South Carolina will oppose the election of any man as President of the United States who believes in social equality and does not draw the color line."

Senator COLE L. BLEASE, Democrat, of South Carolina, made this statement in an interview Tuesday, explaining his insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of an article from the Baltimore Afro-American concerning the Oswald Garrison Villard dinners.

"My reason for putting that article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD," Senator BLEASE said, "was that I wanted the people of the South to

know the real conditions in Washington and to further know that there are men in politics in the Nation who do not draw the 'color line' and are willing to eat at the same table with colored people and associate with them on equal terms."

Senator BLEASE added: "Of course, that is their business if they desire to do so, but it is our business to protect ourselves from placing in office any man who might attempt to force the same conditions upon us in the South."

SENATOR WALSH

It is believed that Senator BLEASE had reference to Senator THOMAS J. WALSH, Democrat, of Montana, who is a candidate for the Democratic nomination, when he inserted the Afro-American article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and made his original statement that "some men do not mind associating at the table with certain other people, but that the people of my State might object to voting for that kind of a man for President of the United States."

FOUR SENATORS AT DINNER

Senator WALSH was one of four Senators who attended the dinner in honor of the tenth anniversary of Mr. Villard's editorship of the Nation. The dinner was at the Washington Hotel, where Senator BLEASE lives, on March 1. There were three other Senators present.

Senator GERALD P. NYE, Republican, of North Dakota presided. Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, Democrat, of Montana, was one of the speakers. The other Senator was young BOB LA FOLLETTE, Republican, of Wisconsin.

MRS. TERRELL THERE

Three colored persons attended the dinner. They were Neval H. Thomas, Dunbar High School teacher and president of the local chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People; Mrs. Mary Church Terrell, widow of the late Judge Robert H. Terrell, and the Rev. Robert W. Brooks, pastor of the Lincoln Temple Congregational Church at Eleventh and R Streets NW. Mrs. Terrell is reported to have sat next to Senator WALSH.

The order to see Senator BLEASE and find out his purpose in inserting the Afro-American article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD came from Carl J. Murphy, the editor of the Afro-American.

There was some trepidation in my approach of Senator BLEASE. But once in his presence it quickly fled. He was affable and spoke freely on the race question.

THINKS HIMSELF "FRIEND"

"I have always been the colored man's friend and am so considered by him to-day," he declared.

"I do not favor social equality," he said, "and the best element of colored people do not want social equality. They want equal rights, equal privileges, and service. The best element of them realizes that when a white man in the South places himself on the level and equality in social matters, that he is not as good as they are, and they do not accept him in their homes as their guest.

MENTIONS MANCE AND WILKINSON

Senator BLEASE referred to a number of colored men in South Carolina, including the Rev. R. W. Mance, whom he hopes and believes will be elected to the bishopric at the next general conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and R. S. Wilkinson, president of the South Carolina Normal and Industrial College.

"I am satisfied," he said, "that they will bear me out in the position that they do not ask for social equality; nor do they seek it; neither are they anxious to hold official positions.

ALL WOULD VOTE FOR HIM

"I am satisfied further that the entire colored population of my State will testify to the fact that the southern white man is their best friend. I believe if it were left to the colored voters of my State, and each and every one of them had the power to cast his vote as he pleases, 90 per cent of them would vote for me for any office for which I might become a candidate."

JIM CROW CAR BILL

Referring to the bill which he has introduced in the Senate to provide separate coaches on street railways in the District of Columbia, Senator BLEASE said that this bill "is not intended as a political strike at or insult to the Negro race, but I believe that the passage of such a bill will prevent at some time very serious trouble in the District of Columbia.

PROTECTION?

"Some white man at some time," he stated, "is going to resist or resent a colored man's, or what he considers a colored man's, attention or discourtesy to some white woman in the street cars. It is going to lead to an assault. Possibly some one in the car may be killed or seriously injured, and it may lead to serious trouble between the races. This can be averted by giving to each race the same car service, the same rate, and forces no one in any inferior or in any embarrassing situation. It is a question of protecting both races."

Senator BLEASE introduced the first bill in the State Legislature of South Carolina to pension a colored person, William Rose, who was the personal body servant of Gen. Macy Gregg in the Confederate Army.

THE FRUIT CAKE

Senator BLEASE has served as trustee of the South Carolina Normal and Industrial College at Orangeburg, S. C. As governor of the State he was chairman of the board of trustees ex officio. Each Christmas from the time of his governorship to the present the girls in the domestic science department have sent to him and Mrs. Blease a fruit cake. He delights to refer to this remembrance even on the floor of the Senate.

COMMON-SCHOOL EDUCATION

"I always advocated common-school education for the colored people," he said, "that is, reading, writing, arithmetic, and those things which it takes to make the colored man a good citizen and to put him into position to take care of himself in whatever deal or transaction in life he might have to make."

RELEASED 1,000 PRISONERS

When he was Governor of South Carolina, Senator BLEASE related, "I found the penitentiary overcrowded with colored people who had been overlooked and had served years and years longer than they should have. They had no money to hire lawyers, no influential friends to work for them, and I took my secretary and went to the penitentiary and interviewed all the various prisoners personally, and I released a thousand or more colored men from that hell-hole and gave them a new chance in life.

"Up to my present reports not a one of them has been recommitted for any violation of the terms of his parole or for having committed any other crime."

[From the Afro-American, Baltimore, Md., Saturday, March 17, 1928]
"CITY'S NATION DINNER MOST MEMORABLE IN SERIES"—VILLARD—VILLARD COMMENDS LOCAL COMMITTEE—NATION FOUNDED TO MAKE WAY EASY FOR FREEDOM OF THOSE WHO ARE A PRICELESS PART OF OUR POPULATION

The Baltimore dinner had given him the real kick of the series, Oswald Garrison Villard declared at the climax of the local Nation dinner at the home of Miss Elizabeth Gilman, where 127 guests joined in paying tribute to the grandson of William Lloyd Garrison, one of America's foremost editors and champions of human rights.

In a jocular, yet serious, vein Mr. Villard declared that the peace and harmony in the other dinners given in his honor had a fitting climax in the experiences of the local committee. In paying a tribute to Miss Elizabeth Gilman and members of the committee he recalled that her father was one of the original backers of the Nation.

BREAK SHACKLES

The Nation, he said, and the old Liberator, which preceded it, came into existence for the express purpose of taking the shackles off colored slaves and of helping these people who had been in bondage for 250 years find a proper place in the country.

It had always been the determination of its founders to devote a part of their space to unpopular causes. The present dinner, because of the difficulty the committee had in finding a place to hold it, had given him another "glorious chance" to stand up for the principles of human brotherhood.

That the Nation and the spirit it fostered may live to fight on, Mr. Villard expressed his hope that these series of dinners would bring behind it a growing group of subscribers and supporters.

JUDGE FRANK PRESIDES

In an opening statement presenting Judge Eli Frank as master of ceremonies, Rabbi Morris S. Lazaron, of Madison Square Temple, stated that "because he believed in God he believed in the brotherhood of man." Joseph Wood Krutch, dramatic editor of the Nation, born, he says, in Tennessee, but often called a "northerner" in the South and a "southerner" in the North, called Eugene O'Neill America's greatest dramatist.

QUOTES CULLEN

Arthur Garfield Hayes, director of the American Civil Liberties Union, and one of the attorneys in the Sweet case in Detroit, referred to the difficulties the committee had had in getting a place to hold the dinner as "a darn good chance to stand up for a square deal."

Mr. Hayes quoted Cullen's poem "Baltimore," and attributed as slavish "fear" on the part of men and women to break through outworn customs and assert themselves according to their own consciences.

He also severely arraigned the Government for its aggressive intervention in smaller countries, declaring that "because I am an American I should rejoice if Sandino should get the best of the marines."

MENCKEN'S LETTER

In a letter expressing his regret that he could not be present on account of a minor operation—referred to jocularly by the toastmaster as an operation which would naturally "increase his air space," Henry L. Mencken said, "Don't have any fear; the Ku-Klux Klan may

heave a possum or a couple of Bibles in at the window, but it will do no worse."

The dinner ended peacefully after the committee had spent a hectic week finding a place where white and colored guests could eat together.

According to Miss Elizabeth Gilman, practically every hotel and public dining room in the city had an opportunity to register its policy on this matter.

The dinner was first arranged at the Southern Hotel; service was withdrawn when the committee faced, told them that colored guests would have to be included.

At first colored guests were advised that some difficulty might arise if they tried to attend the dinner, but Villard, when informed of the ban on colored subscribers, flatly refused to attend if they were barred.

CEILING CAVED IN

It was then transferred to the Arundel Hall, but fortunately permission was later refused here also. On Monday of this week the ceiling in this building caved in, probably fatally wounding three and seriously wounding three others.

Effort to get the Friends' Meeting House on Charles Street met with a refusal, on the ground that the meeting was neither religious nor civic, and could not be held there.

Permission was given and withdrawn at the Friends Meeting House at Park Avenue and Laurens Street.

It was then transferred to the home of Miss Gilman.

In a letter to Miss Gilman, Norman Thomas, executive director of the League for Industrial Democracy, characterized her efforts in behalf of the dinner as "a great service for racial fair play not alone in Baltimore but throughout the country."

Those of the group who attended the dinner were Dr. Ernest Lyon; Liberian Consul General Carl J. Murphy, president of the Afro-American Co.; Dr. C. E. Stewart; John W. Haywood; Dr. A. J. Mitchell; and William N. Jones, managing editor of the Afro.

[From the Afro-American, Baltimore, Md., Saturday, March 17, 1928]

THE NATION DINNER

Why was it that Baltimore daily newspapers gave so much publicity to the Nation dinner staged in honor of Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard, of New York, at the home of Miss Elizabeth Gilman in Baltimore Friday night of last week?

Could it have been because of Mr. Villard's renown as a speaker, his high position as editor of a liberal weekly magazine, the importance of the occasion, or the message or the luster attached to the Garrison name and family?

There must have been something of great significance in the occasion. For five days preceding the dinner the Baltimore Sun carried from one-half to one column of news on its most prominent local page about this event. More than a column, two photographs, and an editorial appeared the day afterwards.

And yet a score of years ago Mr. Villard spoke in Baltimore before an audience of 1,500 persons. He was at that time the brilliant editor of the New York Evening Post, a daily newspaper.

No advance notices of more than an inch appeared in the daily press, and the account of the address which appeared in the Sun next day was short, uninforming, and inconspicuous. It was printed under the heading of "Obituaries."

Mr. Walter T. McGuinn recalled in last week's Afro that Baltimore closed its ears also 100 years ago to the message of Mr. Villard's grandfather, William Lloyd Garrison. Mr. Garrison had to issue his own paper, The Genius of Universal Emancipation, and Baltimore jailed him for condemning the slave trade and demanding immediate emancipation of negro slaves.

For a hundred years Grandfather Garrison and Grandson Villard have harped on the same tune, championing the cause of the weak, helping the slave and the freedmen to find their place as free and equal American citizens.

The reason for the advance publicity to the Nation dinner is to be found in none of the ideas suggested above. It was, however, intimated in the Sun editorial Saturday morning.

The reason was that the two races, black and white, were to sit down at this dinner together, a procedure which the Sun terms contrary to the "firmly established convictions and practices of this community with respect to social contacts between the two races."

The publicity had the desired effect in part. No down-town hotel would make it convenient for the dinner to be held there. Clubs and even Christian churches refused the committee a meeting place.

Miss Gilman, out of a large heart, offered her own home, where the subscribers and friends of Mr. Villard dined, as Mr. Joseph Krutch, of the Nation, facetiously observed, like "conspirators."

In the biggest sense this publicity was ineffectual. Mr. Villard termed the Baltimore dinner the most memorable of the series. Others were staged in Philadelphia, Washington, New York, and Buffalo. He got a "kick," he said, out of the success of Baltimore Nation readers in standing up for the principles of human brotherhood.

Every banquet speaker praised the fine spirit of Miss Gilman and her committee. Nation readers who wished dined and went about their business.

[The Baltimore Sun, Saturday morning, March 10, 1928]
WOULD REJOICE IF SANDINO BEAT MARINES—A. G. HAYS, CIVIL LIBERTIES HEAD, SAYS SO AT DINNER FOR VILLARD—120 WHITE, 7 COLORED GUESTS AT BANQUET—EDITOR CALLS EVENT CHANCE TO STAND UP FOR HUMAN BROTHERHOOD

"Because I am an American I should rejoice if Sandino should get the best of the marines," Arthur Garfield Hays, director of the American Civil Liberties Union, asserted last night at a dinner in honor of Oswald Garrison Villard's tenth anniversary as editor of the Nation.

Mr. Hays's statement was made at the home of Miss Elisabeth Gilman, 513 Park Avenue, where the dinner was held after several days of feverish activity had been passed in attempting to find a place where white persons and negroes could dine together. Seven negroes attended the dinner and were seated with white guests. The white guests numbered 120.

CITES AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS

"How can any American, believing in American institutions, support the actions of the American Government in Nicaragua?" Mr. Hays asked.

"The principles of nonintervention," he added, "and the right to carry on a nation's own affairs of government are not altered merely because the United States is the aggressor."

Judge Eli Frank, associate judge of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City, was toastmaster and introduced the speakers—Mr. Villard, Mr. Hays, and Mr. Joseph Wood Krutch, dramatic editor of the Nation.

CALLS EVENT BALM TO SPIRIT

Mr. Villard, touching on the difficulties of the committee, of which Miss Gilman was a member, in finding a dining place, said it was balm to his spirit to find a "glorious chance" to stand up for the principles of human brotherhood.

These principles, he said, had not been questioned in other cities which recently have held similar dinners in his honor. He feared, he added, his principles were becoming unduly conservative when he heard of the experiences in Baltimore.

The editor appealed for support of independent periodicals, which he called a necessity if democracy was to continue in a country whose daily press, he asserted, was largely controlled by private interests.

Within a few years, Mr. Villard added, views now considered as radical will be thought conservative, as has been the case in the past.

Mr. Krutch spoke on "America's Contribution to Modern Drama," which he described as great. He called New York the modern dramatic capital and asserted that Eugene O'Neill was the greatest American dramatist.

PROTESTS CENSORSHIP

Protesting against censorship, Mr. Krutch said that the best plays might be stopped by a whisper at a time when the American drama was becoming most significant.

"Europe has taken in much of our trash as it has taken in our movies, but American drama has won in Europe a greater amount of respect than any other example of American art," he declared.

A letter from H. L. Mencken, written from a hospital where he is undergoing a minor operation, was read to the guests by Judge Frank. Mr. Mencken expressed his regret at not being able to attend the dinner and assured the guests that—

"The Ku-Klux Klan may heave a possum or a couple of Bibles in at the window, but it will do no worse."

LIST OF GUESTS

The list of guests as given out by Mrs. Reynold A. Spaeth, secretary of the committee, follows:

E. Milton Altfeld, Miss Mary Andrew, Miss Lavinia Bamberger, Mrs. E. P. Barnett, Mrs. Alexander S. Barton, Doctor and Mrs. Berheim, Joseph Bernstein, Dr. M. L. Breitstein, Mrs. William J. Brown, Henry Burke, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Burton, Miss Florence Clothier, M. C. Conkey, R. S. Conkey, Samuel Danzinger, K. M. Dodge, Abraham Epstein, Mrs. N. B. Fagin, J. Frank Fox, Judge and Mrs. Eli Frank, Dr. and Mrs. Leon Freedom, Dr. Ernst Feise, E. I. Feldman, Miss Elizabeth Gilman, Mrs. Leon Ginsberg, H. R. Ginsberg, D. Bengt Hamilton, Miss Margaret Hamilton, Miss Harvey, John Hayward, H. C. Hilken, Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Hollander, Mr. and Mrs. Walter Hollander, Arthur E. Hungerford, Edward Hungerford, Dr. and Mrs. O. E. Janney, W. N. Jones, Dr. and Mrs. Max Kahn, Miss Amelia Kaufman, C. Arthur Keene, E. Krieger, A. H. Krug, Miss Ann G. Kuttner, Miss Clara Landsberg, Rabbi and Mrs. Morris S. Lazon, J. J. McNamara, Bernard Makover, A. J. Mitchell, Judge Jacob Moses, Carl Murphy, Rev. Dr. James Oosterling, David Paulson, Miss Mary M. Read, Miss Caroline Roberts, Mr. and Mrs. Louis Rosenfeld, Miss Ruth Rosenberg, Mr. and Mrs. F. J. Rubenstein, Mr. and Mrs. William Seff, G. K. Seibert, C. D. Sergeant, Miss Evelyn Smith, Phil Smith, C. E. Stewart, Mr. and Mrs. Max Sokol, Miss Nellie Spicer, Fred Starr, Dr. Leo Snyder, Dr. Edward Uhlenhuth, Judge and Mrs. J. N. Ulman, Mrs. Donald B. Van Hollen,

R. E. Vogelmann, Clarence Wagener, Miss E. F. Ward, A. Wilner, Miss Gwendolyn Willis, Dr. and Mrs. S. Wolman, and R. Q. Yardley.

The committee on arrangements was composed of Rabbi Morris S. Lazon of Madison Avenue Temple, Miss Gilman, Arthur E. Hungerford, and Mrs. Spaeth. In introducing the toastmaster, Rabbi Lazon expressed his regret at having been out of the city during the making of entire arrangements for the dinner, which he credited chiefly to Miss Gilman and Mrs. Spaeth.

[From the Baltimore Sun, Saturday, March 10, 1928]

THE VILLARD DINNER

The long series of misadventures attending the dinner to Oswald Garrison Villard, editor of the Nation, is really not the fault of anyone. If some group of Mr. Villard's friends had arranged a dinner for him, it would have been presumptuous on his part to have insisted that negroes should be invited. But, as we understand the facts, the dinner was not to have been one simply of Mr. Villard's friends; it was a dinner of subscribers to the Nation. Naturally, in view of Mr. Villard's well-known views on racial discrimination, he could not condone the color line in such a dinner.

Nor can fault be found, we believe, with the committee which undertook to arrange the dinner. It is easy enough to say that, knowing the firmly established convictions and practices of this community with respect to social contacts between the two races, and knowing also Mr. Villard's views, the dinner never should have been undertaken. But the fact probably is that no one, either on the committee or off it, gave an instant's thought to the possibility of the color question being raised until after Mr. Villard had been invited.

It would have been better had not a very small group of negroes elected to force the issue. It placed in an embarrassing position a group of generous men and women, who were compelled to choose between recalling an invitation to a man whom they honored and running counter to the custom of their own community, a custom which, we have no doubt, they individually uphold. Also, it placed in an embarrassing position a very much larger number of respectable and useful negroes, who perfectly understand and do not object to the social distinctions which prevail in Baltimore, but naturally do not enjoy the emphasis placed on these distinctions in the last few days.

Now that the affair is behind us, the sooner it is forgot the better it will be for all. The relations here between the races are excellent. The whites encourage the progress of the negroes in trades, and they treat fairly those who have entered the professions. They respect the negroes' political rights. There is constantly increasing attention to education of the negroes, as there is to social and physical welfare. In nothing has Baltimore been more spontaneously open handed in many months than the joint effort of the whites and negroes to provide funds for the Provident Hospital—to be conducted for negroes.

The line is drawn sharply only against social contacts, and that line is as satisfactory to the great majority of negroes as it is inflexible for the overwhelming majority of whites.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1181) authorizing an appropriation to be expended under the provisions of section 7 of the act of March 1, 1911, entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," as amended, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. PURNELL, and Mr. ASWELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

GOV. ALFRED E. SMITH

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, for those of us who know Governor Smith, of New York, it was very difficult the other day to keep from uttering bitter words in response to the insinuation by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON]. For myself, I am glad we did not indulge in such words, because the governor himself has shown how idle and unfounded was the charge.

In this matter, as in all other matters of criticism which have been leveled against him, Governor Smith has shown conclusively how false and unworthy are all such charges. He is an upright, untarnished, dependable statesman, a public official who can be trusted in all things at all times.

I ask that the clerk may read from the desk an Associated Press dispatch from Albany, of March 20, as printed in this morning's Washington Post.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the Washington Post, March 21, 1928]

AL SMITH CALLS SINCLAIR CHARGE DEMAGOGIC SLANDER—GOVERNOR, IN SCATHING LETTER TO NYE, DECLARES THAT HE RECEIVED NO FUNDS FROM OIL MAN—SCORES "INSINUATIONS" AS "INFAMOUS"

ALBANY, N. Y., March 20.—Governor Smith to-night characterized as "demagogic slander" statements made by Senator ROBINSON (Republican), Indiana, on the floor of the Senate yesterday that Harry F. Sinclair, a prominent figure in the oil scandal, had been a heavy contributor to the New York State Democratic gubernatorial campaign of 1920.

In a letter to Chairman GERALD P. NYE, of the Teapot Dome committee, Governor Smith declared that "a careful search of the official records made at my request to-day confirmed my recollection that Mr. Sinclair never contributed to my campaign fund either in 1920 or at any other time that I ever ran for office; in fact, I failed of election as governor in 1920, and Mr. Sinclair had been appointed to the racing commission months prior to that election, some four years before there was any thought of the oil scandal."

"I do not propose that either you or Senator ROBINSON of Indiana," the governor continued, "shall escape public humiliation for the infamous insinuations that you have made by your pretense of disclaiming desire to cast reflection on me or stating that your committee has no concern with the matter."

After the governor had written the letter, word was brought to him that Mr. Sinclair had contributed on one occasion to a Democratic campaign fund in New York State. The contribution, made in 1918 to the New York County Democratic committee, amounted to \$1,000, records in the secretary of state's office disclosed.

The same records disclosed, however, that in 1922—the year that Nathan L. Miller opposed and was defeated by Governor Smith—Mr. Sinclair contributed \$5,000 to the Republican State committee. The payment was made, the records showed, to Anson C. Goodyear, treasurer of the State committee.

Careful examination by Secretary of State Robert Moses of contributions to the governor's personal campaign funds failed to disclose any mention of Mr. Sinclair's name. The examination covered every available bit of data filed in the department of state and other State offices.

The statements made before the Senate, the governor asserted, were in the nature of "a Republican counsel of desperation to escape in some measure the penalty for the disgraceful record of the Republican Party in connection with these scandals. No such red herring can be dragged across the trail."

The text of the governor's letter follows:

"You are quoted in the daily papers this morning as having said yesterday on the floor of the Senate, 'I do understand that in the campaign at which Governor Smith was elected Mr. Sinclair was a very liberal contributor to his cause, and that following his election he was made a member of the racing commission of the State.' Senator ROBINSON of Indiana made a similar statement. Your information, wherever you got it, is in every respect false, and these statements were recklessly made.

"A careful search of the official records, made at my request to-day, confirmed my recollection that Mr. Sinclair never contributed to my campaign fund either in 1920 or at any other time that I ever ran for office; in fact, I failed of election as governor in 1920, and Mr. Sinclair had been appointed to the racing commission months prior to that election, some four years before there was any thought of the oil scandals. A few months before the end of his term, early in 1925, I accepted his resignation.

"I do not propose that either you or Senator ROBINSON of Indiana shall escape public humiliation for the infamous insinuations you have made by your pretense of disclaiming desire to cast reflection on me or stating that your committee has no concern with the matter. Without the slightest warrant in fact, and with no basis whatever, you have both made false public statements from which you evidently calculated that people would be misled into believing that I was in some way a beneficiary of the oil scandals. This, no doubt, is a Republican counsel of desperation to escape in some measure the penalty for the disgraceful record of the Republican Party in connection with these scandals. No such red herrings can be dragged across the trail. The complete baselessness of your demagogic slander has aroused the indignation with which I make this protest against your outrageous conduct."

Sinclair, in his resignation on February 5, 1925, told the governor that "it would not be 'convenient' for him to continue in the office of racing commissioner, and gave no other reason, the governor disclosed to-day after a search through the files had brought his letter to light.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I do not know how the Governor of New York feels about this matter except from what I have read in the newspapers. He seems to be very much exercised. He is not so calm and careful in the choice of his language as it seems to me a great statesman ought to be.

I understand he is a candidate for President, and I am just wondering if one of his temperaments were in the White House, charged with the enormous responsibilities of that office and given the tremendous authority of that office, what kind of language he then would use in dealing with the people of this country and with the foreign nations of the world. It looks as though there might be warfare on all hands and trouble from the beginning.

I have no occasion to attack the Governor of New York. I never supposed he would get so much excited about this matter. I have been given to understand from those who espouse his candidacy for the Presidency that he was calm and deliberate, a great student, and a great man; so I am amazed at this outburst in the newspapers this morning from this presidential candidate.

What started it all? Mr. President, I have before me the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Monday. I asked this question, which I quote, of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]:

Mr. President, I would like to ask one other question, either of the Senator from Montana or the Senator from North Dakota. I have been given to understand—I do not know whether it is true or not, but I think it is—that Mr. Harry Sinclair, during 1922, 1923, 1924, and possibly 1925, was a member of the State administration of New York, Governor Smith's administration, as a member of the racing commission there by appointment of Governor Smith. Is that true or not?

Mr. President, that is a harmless question. I was simply trying to develop the fact that Mr. Sinclair was a member of Governor Smith's administration, and since Governor Smith is so proud of his administration and those who espouse his candidacy are so proud of that administration, I supposed he would gladly take Harry Sinclair to his bosom and say, "Yes; he is a part of that administration, and I am glad he is." But, no, Mr. President—

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. WHEELER. I was just going to observe—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Just a moment; I do not wish to yield until I finish this phase of the question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana declines to yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I quote further from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday last:

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I am unable to advise the Senator with respect to it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Is there any evidence on that question?

Mr. President, this had to do with whether he was a member of Governor Smith's administration.

Mr. NYE. There is no evidence that has come to my attention that Mr. Sinclair was a member of Mr. Smith's administration after 1920. That, however, is a matter with which our committee has had no relationship at all. I do understand that in the campaign of 1920, at which Governor Smith was elected, Mr. Sinclair was a very liberal contributor to his cause; and that following the election he was made a member of the Racing Commission of the State of New York.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I want to inquire of the Senator from North Dakota, the chairman of the committee, whether he is speaking from information before the committee?

Mr. NYE. I have just made that very clear, and I hope the Senator will get it, that I was not speaking for the committee.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Does the Senator speak from information—

Mr. NYE. He does.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Before the committee?

Mr. NYE. Not before the committee.

Mr. President, is there anything there for this statesman to become so exercised about?

I now yield to the Senator from Montana if he still desires me to yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I merely wanted to observe that probably Governor Smith did not want to take Sinclair to his bosom and take him away from the Republicans.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Well, Mr. President, I do not understand that Sinclair has ever been a member of any Republican administration; I am not certain on that score, but from all the information at my hands he has never been a member of any Republican administration, and he was a member of a Democratic administration.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the Senator say Mr. Sinclair has not dealt with a Republican administration?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Oh, Mr. President, Sinclair dealt with everybody; he dealt with Republicans and Democrats. I say that the Republican rank and file of America is composed of honest, patriotic, God-fearing American citizens. I want to be fair with the Senator from Kentucky and I want to be fair with the Democratic Party, and I am willing to agree that the rank and file of the Democratic Party is composed of good citizens all over the country.

This is not a question of politics. In that connection, Mr. President, when I have a little more time, I am going into the Teapot Dome matter somewhat at length; and then I think I shall be able to develop the fact definitely that in both parties men prominently placed have betrayed the trust imposed in them by the rank and file, and that men like Sinclair do not confine their efforts or their activities to either party. They have no party especially; but the Governor of New York did appoint Sinclair as a member of his administration, and he remained there throughout several years. I want to go into that for just a second.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. I agree with the Senator that the rank and file of the Republican Party are honest; but does not the Senator think by reason of that fact that they ought to repudiate both the last administration and the present administration because of the things that have been carried on and because of the donations that Sinclair and Doheny and their crowd have made?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I am not sure about that; that will come up later; but I might observe, since the Senator has brought it up, that three Democratic members left the Cabinet of the last Democratic administration to take employment under Doheny, and Doheny and Sinclair rest in the same bed, and they have got a lot of Democrats in it with them, too. So I do not see, Mr. President, that there is any point in the question that has just been suggested, for the reason that the Senator from Montana who has just asked the question might suggest further that the whole Democratic administration which has just passed into history be repudiated also.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, will the Senator let me ask him a question?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. HEFLIN. The Senator suggested that Sinclair and Doheny were in the same bed, and that they had a lot of Democrats in there with them. I do not agree to that; but if the Senator can designate them, if the Senator can point out a single Democrat who has been corrupt, I for one Senator will denounce him on this floor and repudiate him?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. What does the Senator say about Mr. Doheny?

Mr. HEFLIN. I repudiated him three years ago, and he quit the Democratic Party.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Doheny was a candidate for Vice President on the Democratic ticket back in 1920, and was voted on as a candidate. Does the Senator now undertake to read out of the party one who has been so high in the councils of the party that his own party voted on him for Vice President of the United States?

Mr. HEFLIN. He was not in congenial company with the Democratic Party, and he went over to the Republican Party.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. He was in the company of the distinguished Senator from Montana, who was guided by his advice on this floor in some of the observations he made when this leasing question was before the Senate.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, to whom—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. He was in the company of Mr. McAdoo, whom he afterwards employed at an estimated salary of \$100,000 a year. He was in the company of the late Franklin K. Lane, whom he employed for \$50,000 a year. Are not they good Democrats?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Did the Senator from Indiana, in the remarks just made, refer to the senior Senator from Montana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I referred to the Senator who is now speaking.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Will the Senator give the Senate a reference to any comment made by me on the floor in defense of Mr. Doheny?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes, Mr. President; I will read the Senator's own language, I think day after to-morrow, in a

speech on this subject that I am trying to prepare, to be delivered in the Senate on that day.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It will be enlightening.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. At that time I shall give the Senate the references, and also the Senator's language.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a suggestion?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If it is not too long. I want to get through with Mr. Smith.

Mr. BLAINE. I will ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the Democratic National Convention at San Francisco in 1920 kicked out the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], and kicked Mr. Doheny, who received votes as a candidate for Vice President, into that convention?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I think that is correct. I only have the newspaper reports; but I understood that the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who now is a candidate for President according to the newspaper reports, did knock at the door and was refused admission at the San Francisco convention.

Mr. President, to proceed, I was paying my respects to the distinguished Governor of New York. He states, if I quote him correctly:

In fact, I failed of election as governor in 1920 and Mr. Sinclair had been appointed to the racing commission months prior to that election.

Mr. President, "months prior to that election"—how many months? The record shows, if I have it correctly, and I think I have, that Gov. Al. Smith appointed Harry F. Sinclair as a member of his administration, as a member of the racing commission, for an unexpired term on the 12th day of January, 1920, when his campaign was looming for the next November. This was for an unexpired term.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Just a second, and I will. I do not want to be interrupted right at this place.

The governor appointed Sinclair on January 12, 1920, for an unexpired term which, I understand, would have expired December 31, 1920; but the Governor of New York was so enamored of Harry F. Sinclair, he thought so much of him and his great constructive ability, he was so anxious to have him in his administration permanently, that on June 3, 1920, the same year, he reappointed Mr. Sinclair for a five-year term, a full term, which would not expire normally until the last of the year 1925.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there before he leaves that part of his argument?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. All right; I will yield right now.

Mr. TYDINGS. Assuming that Governor Smith did appoint Mr. Sinclair at a time when none of these facts had been developed, and at a time when he had a right to believe that he was a man of some reputation—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And just before election.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator mean to contend that Governor Smith was corrupt, or that he shielded a criminal, or that he had in his administration a man that he should not have had by reason of some prior happening?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I want the country to make its own deductions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Answer the question "yes" or "no."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I want the country to draw its own conclusions. I am stating some facts here; that is all.

Mr. CARAWAY. That is the strangest statement the Senator has made yet.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me ask the Senator another question. I have just read in a morning paper where a man named Faison, down in Virginia, was convicted of murder. The chances are that he is a white man and a Democrat. Does not the Senator think, by the same analogy, that Senators SWANSON and GLASS ought to be unseated because perchance a Democrat committed murder in the State of Virginia?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, that is taking us far afield. I hope the Senator does not mean to connect Governor Smith with murder. I would not go that far.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another observation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana further yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Not just now; a little later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, Governor Smith says Mr. Sinclair had been appointed to the racing commission "months before," giving to the American people the intimation that it was a long while before. It was just the June before, when he reappointed him to a full term on the commission that would not expire until 1925.

What happened then, Mr. President? My information is that he resigned one month before the full term expired—one month before.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. COPELAND. What other appointments did the governor make at the same time he appointed Mr. Sinclair?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I am talking about Harry F. Sinclair and his friend the Governor of New York. I do not care about anybody else. I am not going into that.

Mr. COPELAND. I mean, on that particular racing commission, and at the same time. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the distinguished and incorruptible Gen. James W. Wadsworth, sr., the father of our ex-colleague, was appointed at the same time? Does the Senator make the same reflections upon that distinguished patriot?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Why, of course, not, Mr. President. That was an excellent appointment. I suppose the Governor of New York has made some good appointments. I have no doubt of the fact; but I am speaking of the Sinclair appointment, which stinks to heaven, in my judgment.

Mr. President, just one other thing. As a matter of fact, according to my information, Mr. Sinclair resigned one month before the full term expired, which was late in 1925. I wonder why he was retained during all those years. Mark you, he was appointed twice—first for an unexpired term, then for a full term—and then, through all this discussion of the Sinclair matter and the Doheny troubles, and the Teapot Dome racket, he still continued to be a member of the administration of Governor Smith of New York.

Governor Smith could easily have said to Harry F. Sinclair, "Now, Mr. Sinclair, you are unclean. It has developed that you are unclean. You are not fit for a Democratic administration, because we Democrats here and all of us who believe in Tammany Hall are thoroughly clean, and we do not want you in our administration." But did Mr. Smith do that? No. The Governor of New York never did fire Mr. Sinclair. He finally resigned on his own account. No wonder the Governor of New York this morning feels badly; but he should blame himself and his associations. "Birds of a feather will flock together."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes; if the Senator insists on defending Governor Smith, of New York, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am not here for the purpose of defending anybody; but I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana if, after he finishes with the Governor of New York, he will enlighten us by giving us his opinion of the Governor of Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I am not discussing that. The Senator can discuss Indiana as far as he pleases. I will only say in that connection that Indiana needs no defense from me. Indiana stands, and has at many times in the past stood, as the saving force of the American Republic; and Indiana to-day, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky, might give the Senator some suggestions on how economically to run a State. Indiana to-day is one of four States in this Union that are completely out of debt. Can the Senator from Kentucky say as much about his State?

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator said a while ago that he was not here to defend Indiana. Is he here to defend the Governor of Indiana—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I am speaking now about the Governor of New York.

Mr. BARKLEY (continuing). Either the present governor or the one who went to the penitentiary, and on his way from it almost met the present governor on his way to it?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that the Governor of Indiana is not a candidate for President, and I understand the Governor of New York is. Furthermore, Mr. President, Harry F. Sinclair never was a part of any administration in Indiana, either Republican or Democratic, and he was a part of the Democratic administration of New York.

Mr. BARKLEY. But the Governor of Indiana is a part of the Republican administration of the State of Indiana; and the distinguished Senator himself owes his seat in this body to the appointment given him by a Governor of Indiana, whom he says he will not defend.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, does the Senator take exception to that? I hope the Senator does not object to my being here. I was originally appointed by the Governor of Indiana, but subsequently was nominated and elected in my own right.

Mr. DILL. But the Senator drew such terrible conclusions from the fact of the appointment of Sinclair by Governor Smith, and yet he was appointed by a man who was convicted.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. It may have been the exercise of bad judgment on the part of the Governor of Indiana to appoint me to this body. I am not saying it was not; but while I am a Member of this body I shall certainly speak my mind on subjects that affect the people of my State and the country. Just now I am talking about the Governor of New York. The Senator, in his time, can discuss any subject he desires.

Mr. DILL. But the Senator says that "birds of a feather flock together."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is true. I have no occasion to make any different observation on that subject.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President—

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I still say that the Governor of New York had Mr. Sinclair as a member of his administration.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Yes; I will.

Mr. HARRISON. In connection with "birds of a feather flocking together," is it not true also that the mayor of the city of Indianapolis, of the Senator's own party, as well as the chairman of the Republican national campaign committee of Indiana as well as the chairman of the campaign committee of Marion County, and four councilmen in the city of Indianapolis, all members of the Senator's own party, all "birds of the same feather," are either in the penitentiary or now under indictment in the State of Indiana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, of course, all the Senator says I could not follow; he had so many designations there.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator agrees to it, does he not?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I do not think the statement is true in any sense of the word; but even if it were, none of the parties mentioned is a candidate for President at this time, and the distinguished Governor of New York, I understand, is a candidate for President, and none of them has had any connection with Harry F. Sinclair.

Mr. President, I understand that finally Mr. Sinclair has resigned from the administration of Governor Smith of New York, and therefore I suppose that ends that. But since it all was true, and he was very friendly to the Governor of New York during all these years, I am wondering why the Governor of New York suddenly is so thoroughly outraged when the fact is brought to the attention of the people of the United States.

Mr. COPELAND obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. COPELAND. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. May I ask the Senator from Indiana if he was not the attorney for D. C. Stephenson, who is now in the penitentiary in Indiana also?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, at one time my law firm represented D. C. Stephenson in some civil matters. That is a matter of record which the Senator could easily get without asking me the question.

Mr. HARRISON. I thought I could get it quicker that way.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I hope the Senator does not take any exception to that employment.

Mr. HARRISON. Not a bit. I am glad for the confession to come from the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, referring to the statement of the Senator that "birds of a feather flock together," I should like to ask him if he desires to convey the impression that his political associations in Indiana running back over several years are to be judged by the same test?

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana is amazed, he says, that Governor Smith shows feeling and indignation over the charges made against him on this floor. The Senator has said that on day after to-morrow he is going to make a speech. I wish at that time he would tell us if it

is so common a thing to have approaches made to Republican officeholders that they have lost all sense of reaction against any insinuation such as was made here.

Governor Smith has the temperament, to use the Senator's word, to resent charges of this sort. He has a temperament that would make him resist any attempt to bribe or corrupt him. He has a temperament which would guarantee to this country an undefiled and an undefilable public official. Mr. President, there is no need, as I see it, to multiply words, because the governor himself has spoken for himself, and very conclusively.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, of course, the letter from Governor Smith refutes conclusively the wild and unwarranted insinuations of the Senator from Indiana. Of course, the Senator is coming up for reelection, and he may have a hard fight. That may explain the Senator's strange and extraordinary course. The former chairman of the Republican National Campaign Committee has been an influential political factor in the State of Indiana, and the Senate as well as the country is familiar with the exposé in regard to the Liberty bonds that were peddled by Chairman Hays.

The Senate is also familiar with the evidence that came forth at Chicago the other day from Mr. Connery that \$85,000 that had been spent in some speculation there was paid by the bonds that came from Mr. Sinclair to Mr. Hays. But evidently the Senator believes he must play his small part in bringing to his aid the influence, if not the bonds, of Mr. Hays in Indiana in the coming election.

When the Senator from Indiana was elected, his campaign was directed by the chairman of the Republican State campaign committee at that time, a man by the name of Clyde Walb. Walb was a great friend and henchman of the Senator from Indiana. He is now under indictment by the courts of Indiana for corruption. "Birds of a feather flock together."

The chairman of the Marion County committee of the Republican Party, George Coffin, another political friend and henchman of the Senator, is now under indictment for fraud and corruption in the State of Indiana. "Birds of a feather flock together."

The mayor of the city of Indianapolis, a Republican, possibly elected at the same time the Senator from Indiana was, certainly one of his political friends, if not his henchman, is under indictment in the State of Indiana for fraud and corruption. "Birds of a feather flock together."

Four of the Republican councilmen in the city of Indianapolis, elected, perhaps, at the same time the Senator from Indiana was, if not his henchmen, his political friends, are all indicted for fraud and corruption. "Birds of a feather flock together."

The late Governor of the State of Indiana, George McCray, was indicted for bribery, I believe, or some kind of corruption. He was a Republican, a political friend, and maybe a henchman, of the Senator from Indiana. "Birds of a feather flock together."

When the Senator came here he was appointed by Governor Jackson, one of his strong political friends, and each was a henchman of the other. Governor Jackson, following the appointment of the distinguished Senator from Indiana to the Senate, was indicted for bribery out there and pleaded the statute of limitations, and on that alone he got out. "Birds of a feather flock together."

Of course, the Senator answered the question that D. C. Stephenson was his client. He was not only his client, but was a political friend and henchman. He was sent afterwards to the penitentiary for something. Perhaps it was bribery, or some other kindred crime. "Birds of a feather flock together." What a travesty upon American politics, and what a reflection upon the proud name of Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, just this observation: None of those mentioned by the Senator from Mississippi happens to be a candidate for the Presidency. I am not a candidate for the Presidency. I understand the Governor of New York is a candidate for the Presidency. Furthermore, none of those mentioned by the Senator from Mississippi has had any relations with Harry F. Sinclair, and Governor Smith has, and Sinclair was a member of Governor Smith's administration.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, the people are very much interested in candidates for the Presidency and those who are candidates should make known their positions, and their records should be known to the people. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the record of Gov. Alfred E. Smith upon this subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNOR SMITH'S WET RECORD—REMARKS ON ALFRED E. SMITH'S RECORD AS TAMMANY LEADER, LEGISLATOR, AND GOVERNOR

Mr. President, we are being told these days that there is no longer doubt that Gov. Alfred E. Smith, of New York, will be the next President of the United States. Those of us who are dry, or who nevertheless favor enforcing the laws and upholding the Constitution, and who have not been entirely pleased with Mr. Smith's attitude on these matters, are being reassured that we have nothing to fear. We are told that because of fear of impeachment the dry character of the Congress, and such considerations, no President, however wet, would fail to uphold both the law and the Constitution. Thus, our friends, the wet leaders, say in effect: "Of course, Smith would like to hurt prohibition all he could, but he wouldn't dare do much."

That argument sounds suspicious to me. Here is a man running for President, and one of his chief claims to consideration is that he will get all the wet vote. Why would this be, I would like to know, unless the wet voters expect that he could and would relax the enforcement of prohibition? Is this campaign talk intended to mislead the wet voters—or us who are dry? It is a very novel experience to be asked to support a man whose views on one of the chief issues of the campaign are directly opposed to mine on the ground that what he thinks and desires on this issue is of no importance anyway!

No, Mr. President; our friends the wet leaders have been misleading us on this matter. Al Smith, or any other wet, could do much to injure prohibition. Let me quote from the recent speech of a man who is as familiar with the workings of our Federal Government and with the powers of the President as any man alive, one whose Democracy has never been questioned, and one upon whom the friends of prohibition know they can depend.

The following is taken from the address of William Gibbs McAdoo at Richmond, Va., on February 1, 1928:

"Attempt is being made to convince the country that no matter if a wet is elected President the Constitution and laws will be enforced. This is both unsound and untrue. Neither the Constitution nor the laws of the United States are self-executing. The President is charged by the Constitution with the express duty of protecting and defending the Constitution and executing the laws of the land. In doing this he has, of necessity, wide latitude and discretion. If he is opposed to the laws he is called upon to execute he can neglect them or fail to exert his power and authority in such manner that the despised laws will become impotent without subjecting himself to tangible criticism or possible impeachment.

"To say that a President hostile to the eighteenth amendment and the prohibition laws can not seriously imperil effective enforcement throughout the United States is upon its face an absurdity. The President has the power to appoint the judges of the Supreme Court, the judges of all the circuit and district courts throughout the United States, the prosecuting attorneys, the United States marshals, the Secretary of the Treasury and his assistants—those officials being directly charged with enforcement of the prohibition laws. If he should appoint to these responsible positions men who are hostile to the laws the effect upon their successful enforcement would be profound.

"Moreover, the President is primarily responsible for the Budget through which the Congress makes appropriations for prohibition enforcement. He can largely influence the size of the appropriations, which if inadequate, seriously impair the ability to enforce the law. He has the power to veto appropriation and other bills enacted by Congress, and through such power to reduce the appropriations to such a small amount as to paralyze prohibition enforcement.

"He has a tremendous influence upon public opinion, and through his speeches and messages to Congress and the use of general patronage, which is a powerful weapon in his hands, he could, if he were opposed to the eighteenth amendment and the prohibition laws, lead a formidable movement for their repeal. The White House in the hands of the liquor interests would be a veritable Gibraltar of offensive operations, and the doom of the eighteenth amendment would be written boldly on the face of the Constitution."

Mr. President, there can be no question that every word of this is true; it is good law and good sense. We can depend upon no assurance that Mr. Smith, as President, would not follow the course here so clearly indicated. We can judge what he would do only by what he has done; we can predict his future only from his past. We must look backward to learn whether, if Smith were President next year, it would not be true that the White House would be made a veritable Gibraltar in the hands of the liquor interests.

Here, then, is Al Smith's record as a Tammany leader, legislator, and governor, so far as it affects prohibition. It is given as he made it; there is no need of argument or comment from myself. It is not what he now wishes it were, but it is history, and unchangeable. It is not a collection of quotations about what he says he thinks; it is a record of conduct. No item in it can be truthfully denied. I would like merely, without comment, to point out one curious coincidence, shown by the record, which might pass unnoticed unless emphasized. It was in 1919 that it became possible that popular action, in some sections,

might be advantageous to the liquor interests instead of hostile to them. It was in that same year that Mr. Smith, also for the first time, developed that steadfast and unyielding, that sincere and unselfish conviction that the people themselves should rule, which has been so charming and appealing a part of his personality ever since. But his record began long before then.

1. RECORD ON ALLOWING PEOPLE TO CHECK SALOONS

1907. April 3: As legislator, voted to uphold excise committee and strangle local option bill in committee.

1910. April 26: Voted against amending Raines law so as to allow local option in cities.

1911. May 24: Voted against local option for cities. July 19: Voted against Gray local option bill.

1912. Voted against Lincoln bill to allow local option to third-class cities.

1913. As speaker of the assembly, appointed 8 Tammany men out of 13 members of excise committee, and smothered all temperance legislation.

1914. March 19: Voted against Gillet bills to grant local option to cities, city subsidiaries, and counties.

1915. March 31: Voted against Fish bill for referendum on State prohibition. April 7: Voted against Preswick bill to grant local option to university city of Ithaca. April 29: Voted against Howard bill granting same rights as Fish bill.

2. RECORD ON REGULATION OF LIQUOR TRAFFIC AND ITS SEPARATION FROM VICE

1904. March 18: Unrecorded on bill putting additional restrictions in the Raines law.

1905. Voted against the Prentice bill to kill assignation houses and houses of ill fame run as "Raines law" hotels, thereby voting to continue infamous "Raines law hotel" abuses. Passed over 2 to 1 against his opposition.

1908. Voted against bill stiffening up regulatory and enforcement features of the liquor tax law.

1913. As speaker, engineered the defeat of the Knight bill against knowingly delivering liquor in dry territory except to bona fide consignee.

3. RECORD IN FAVOR OF BREAKING DOWN FORMER SAFEGUARDS AGAINST LIQUOR TRAFFIC

1904. April 14: Voted to force hotel bars into over 300 dry towns and make hotels independent of town local-option elections, and thus by robbing the popular vote of part of its effect to nullify the town-option feature of the liquor tax law.

1912. Voted for Hackett bill to make it harder to convict New York City liquor dealers for violating the law.

1913. February 26: Engineered passage of McCue bill emasculating a saloon ratio section of liquor tax law.

March 26: As speaker, engineered the passage of the McCue bill to save convicted liquor-law violators from revocation of their licenses.

4. RECORD IN FAVOR OF LIQUOR SELLING ON SUNDAY AND FOR LIMITATION OF PROHIBITED AREAS

1907. March 26 and April 23: Voted for opening up prohibited areas to sale of liquors.

1911. May 24: Voted for Walker bill increasing hours for sale of liquors.

1913. As speaker, helped desperate effort all through session to pass bill legalizing the opening of saloon on Sunday in New York City. Engineered passage of Walker bill increasing hours of sale of liquors.

5. RECORD IN FAVOR OF PERMITTING SALOONS WITHIN 200 FEET OF SCHOOLS AND ABOLISHING THE PROHIBITED AREAS ABOUT CHURCHES

Governor Smith has said that the saloon "is and ought to be a defunct institution in this country." Here is his record:

1908. Voted for bill to remove all zone provisions protecting churches and schools from saloons.

1909. Introduced and pushed bill to permit hotel bars within church and school zones.

1911. Voted for Sullivan bill opening up prohibited zones about churches and schools to hotel bars.

1913. As speaker, engineered passage of bill permitting saloon within 200 feet of private schools.

6. RECORD ON EIGHTEENTH AMENDMENT AND VOLSTEAD ACT AS GOVERNOR AND TAMMANY LEADER OF NEW YORK STATE DEMOCRACY

Let me point out that in all these acts Mr. Smith was not dealing with a theory of prohibition, but with the same Constitution and laws which he would have to enforce as President.

1919. As governor, after a campaign in which ratification of the amendment had been a chief issue, demanded that the legislature delay ratification till a referendum could be held. When ratification was made by the legislature in spite of him, he said the legislature had acted "without knowing the will of the people."

1920. As governor, in his message to the legislature declared amendment had not been adopted, though it had been ratified by 45 States, and demanded that previous ratification be rescinded.

Also he openly supported the nullifying beer bill, and when it was passed by the legislature signed it without asking a referendum, saying that "when a substantial majority of both houses makes its declaration upon a matter of this sort it is representative of the majority sentiment of the State."

1920. In campaign for reelection, demanded amendment of Volstead Act, because United States Supreme Court had killed his nullification beer act.

1921. In campaign for reelection began his demand for repeal of Mullan-Gage Act, which gave support of State power to enforcement of prohibition.

During same year was present at the drunken and riotous police lieutenant's dinner, which New York Evening Post declared was "an impudent challenge to law that not even the most determined opponents of the Volstead Act can regard with equanimity."

1923. As governor fought openly for repeal of Mullan-Gage enforcement act, personally coerced the dry Democratic senator who finally cast the single deciding vote for repeal. Smith by this act practically destroyed all authority of the 33,000 members of the law enforcement machinery of the State to take action in prohibition violations, leaving the whole task in the hands of some 500 Federal officers—an impossible task.

1926. As governor he advocated and secured the passage of the act for a referendum on the Volstead Act, so worded as to be most misleading, and afterwards induced the legislature to send as memorial to Congress, as if the whole business were anything but a gesture for the comfort of the wets, or had any legal significance.

Mr. President, this completes the record of Al Smith's deeds in regard to prohibition. During his last two terms there has been nothing further he could do to injure it or to prevent its enforcement. But this record would not be complete without a statement of his own, setting forth his attitude toward the law. Let me quote this striking demand for nullification, and for a referendum on the whole subject, made by the same man who, before 1919 had opposed even local option on the saloon evil. It is taken from an interview in the New York Times of November 7, 1926. He has not amended this position in any way since then, so far as I have been able to learn. He said:

"When a majority of 20,000,000 people in five different States affirms by vote that the prohibition statutes are unwelcome and ineffective, Congress must heed that declaration. Never before has the American people had an opportunity to express their judgment on this issue. If that judgment could be made effective to-morrow by any established means, we should see the end of prohibition.

"Everybody knows that the eighteenth amendment was the work of legislatures and not the will of the people. Under constitutional provisions there was no method by which the people could register their opposition or approval. They had to take what the legislatures gave them, and the eighteenth amendment was the present. But we have just seen the popular will expressed in impressive measures via the ballot.

"If popular government means anything to us, State referendums can not fail to influence Congress. Now is the time to submit legislation permitting the States to define the alcoholic content of beverages sold within their borders. The amendment prohibits intoxicants only, but it is ridiculous to specify one-half of 1 per cent as the maximum for a nonintoxicating drink. Each State should have the authority to determine that matter for its own citizens. * * *

"The time has come to take the first steps in correcting a grave error committed at a moment when public liberty was subordinated to national stress. * * * The amendment * * * has failed entirely to bring about the results promised."

Here we have Mr. Smith's whole position to-day. It requires little comment, but one illogical and astounding statement stands out and is the very keystone of his reasoning. It is that "Each State should have the authority to determine for its own citizens" what constitutes intoxicating liquor. Mr. President, could anything be more absurd? This is a question of fact, not of politics. It can no more be determined by a vote of the people than can the hour of sunrise. Why, Mr. President, if this idea were adopted we should have, as Mr. Smith clearly intends, different standards in different States, and it would be entirely possible for such States as Mr. Smith's to set the percentage of alcoholic content so high that prohibition in that State would become completely abortive. Is not that just what Mr. Smith intends? Does it not prove conclusively his desire to nullify the eighteenth amendment so far as possible?

And can we believe that such a man in the White House could and would do no harm to prohibition?

In the addition to the foregoing record, Governor Smith's philosophy on prohibition is well summed up in the following unguarded statement which appeared in the New York Times on March 9, 1923. The Times quoted Governor Smith, who had been talking to a reporter about a beer bill introduced in Congress by a New Jersey Senator, as saying: "I would be glad to go down and help him put over his bill if that will get us somewhere where we can put a foot on the rail again and blow off the froth."

If "putting a foot on the rail and blowing off the froth" does not mean the saloon, what does it mean? If Smith is not only against prohibition but in favor of the saloon, how else can this statement be interpreted?

The beer saloon and the wine saloon under a modified Volstead law means greater laxity in the enforcement of such a modified prohibition law, all of which would result in heavier beers, heavier wines, and greater quantities of poison liquor. "Blowing off the froth" will then mean the return of "blowing in the family earnings" at the corner saloon.

We have placed the prohibition principle in the Constitution of the United States, and since this is so it is the duty of every law-abiding citizen to vote to elect a prohibition administration—the only administration that will enforce the law.

SHAMEFUL PROHIBITION RECORD

Governor Smith made this record and he and his friends must face it. This bitter conflict between the rebellious liquor traffic, which is defying our Constitution, suppressing our laws, trampling and besmirching our flag, will go on until the whole people are aroused to the sinister designs upon our constitutional Government and the right-minded, law-abiding citizens have reestablished respect for and observance of our Constitution. Then, and not until then, can there be a full realization of the great value and beneficence of the eighteenth amendment and the Volstead Act; then, and not until then, can the happiness and welfare of the people and the advancement of civilization be assured.

Dr. R. P. Hutton, superintendent of Rhode Island Anti-Saloon League, formerly associate State superintendent of West Virginia with Dr. T. M. Hare, in a recent Sunday address at Martinsburg emphasized the need for every patriot to become aroused to the dangerous conditions confronting the country. In part he said:

"We are in a presidential campaign which is hotter now, six months before the nominations, than it usually is six weeks before the election, because, so far as the wets are concerned, this campaign started six years before the election. With them the Madison Square convention was simply a dress rehearsal or a practice game. Nineteen hundred and twenty-eight is and always has been their objective."

Those who would modify the Volstead Act or repeal the constitutional amendment never tire in finding fault with the present conditions. They glibly point to the bootleg infractions of the law, forgetting that under the old licensed-saloon systems and local-option plan the courts were deluged with cases of all kinds and characters due to the results of the sale of intoxicants or to the violations of the then existing regulatory laws of the town, city, State, and Nation. These defenders of the so-called "personal liberty," these nullifiers of the Constitution, never point to the increased deposits in savings banks, increased comforts for the average families, nor to the largely increased number of happy mothers and children, since the adoption of the eighteenth amendment.

THE FATHER AND THE BOY

Among the private papers of the late Frank L. Mays, editor of the Pensacola Journal, was the following, in which he tells of a father's hopes for his baby boy:

"At home in his mother's arms to-night I have a baby boy; a little, laughing, rosy fellow. The bloom of youth is on his cheeks, the laughter of childhood on his lips, the light of love and trust in his eyes. The patter of his little feet and the prattle of his baby tongue are music sweeter to me than all the symphonies of the spheres.

"He is a baby now. He knows nothing of the great world's trouble and turmoil, the temptations, the pitfalls, the dangerous and devious ways of life. Supreme in the domain of a mother's love and a father's care, he is not concerned with the problem of to-day or the possibilities of to-morrow. He only knows that he is happy, and the dreams of his little life are all realized in the joys which babyhood brings and leaves.

"But the little fellow will be a man some day. He will awake some morning to find that somewhere, somehow, in the slumber zone which none of us can comprehend, he has passed from boyhood to manhood, and he will leave his father's roof to face and fight the battles of life. When he does so he will meet foes and find conditions that he never knew existed. He will see inequality and injustice and human suffering wrought of avarice and vice. He will find mantraps and gilded vestibules of crime existing under the cloak of respectability and the protection of the law. He will see the strong oppressing the weak, and he will hear the cry of the defenseless before the grinding wheels of privilege and power. He will face conditions which breed poverty and want and awful misery on the one hand, and out of which grow opulence and luxury and unearned ease upon the other.

"And when he finds these things—as he will find them, because there will be evils to combat as well as now—I want him to know two things. I want him to know, first, that his father was not responsible for those conditions; and I want him to know, second, that his father did what he could to prevent them."

Mothers and fathers, stop, look, and listen! There must be no nullification of the Volstead Act or the eighteenth amendment. "It is to-day, as it ever has been and ever will be, a moral issue, an issue of governmental respect, without which civilization and sound govern-

ments can not be builded and maintained. The enemy of prohibition is entrenched in every neighborhood and every community and is using an unlimited amount of money to buy back into power, to the degradation of mankind, the liquor traffic." What are you doing to prevent it? Your one great weapon of defense is to vote to prevent the selection of their candidate to the high office of President of the United States.

To permit the return of the barroom with all its attendant evils would be a crime against the American home, a crime against the moral, uplifting forces of the Nation, and a crime against the highest and best interests of all American citizens.

Mr. HEFLIN. I also ask to have printed in the Record a review of Governor Smith's election in New York State in 1924, by Hon. W. D. Jamison, a former Member of Congress from the State of Iowa. This article appears in the Window Seat. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE POLITICAL MYTH OF ALFRED E. SMITH

Democrats, let's do the unusual thing! Let's look the situation square in the face, and surprise everybody by using some common horse sense once, just for a change.

The principal foundation of the Smith strength and urge is built on the assumption that he could carry New York this fall if he were nominated. His partisan supporters shout it from the housetops. If he could not do that, then there would be nothing to his candidacy. The fact is:

Smith can not carry New York for President this fall!

Analyze the New York vote in 1924, and this overlooked fact will come clearly into view. There was a well-known "Cal and Al" trade between the Republican machine and Tammany in New York State in 1924. The result was that Cal was given approximately 150,000 Democratic votes for President in exchange for approximately the same number of Republican votes for Al for governor. The result of this corrupt trade was that Cal carried the State by 850,000 and Al carried it by a little over 100,000. Except for this corrupt trade Al would not have won. There can be no such trade if Al is nominated for President. Nothing to trade. You see the Republican machine wants to control nationally, while Tammany is concerned primarily about winning in New York City especially, and in the State incidentally. Tammany would be more apt to trade against Al this fall than for him. This is one reason Al can not win New York for President this fall.

Another reason Al can not possibly carry New York this fall is in the fact that in 1924 the Tammany machine which was back of him got out 95 per cent of the registered vote in New York City, while only 75 per cent of the registered State vote outside New York City went to the polls. In other words, 500,000 up-State voters, largely dry and Republicans, did not vote, because they had no choice on the dry question because both Al and his Republican opponent, Roosevelt, were wet, and these disgusted up-State voters simply stayed at home. You bet they would come out this fall if Al were nominated, because they would then have a chance to express themselves. The Republicans will nominate a dry for President, no doubt about that, and even if Al could carry his Tammany-infested city by as big a majority as he did in 1924 (which is impossible), those up-State Republicans would come down on him like a thousand of bricks. I would expect to see Al lose New York by from 300,000 to 600,000 votes.

Isn't his losing New York State, in consideration of the above facts and circumstances, as plain to you as the nose on your face? Then let's not be foolish.

In the above paragraphs I have touched only the high spots about the situation. Below is a more complete analysis of the figures and of the conditions. I give it out of consideration for those who are interested enough to do a little pondering and a little thinking for themselves. (Most of us prefer to have somebody else do our thinking and make up our minds for us.)

In New York in 1924 Coolidge had 1,820,000 presidential votes; Davis, 950,000; all others, 486,000; total, 3,256,000. Coolidge's plurality over Davis, 870,000; majority over all, 384,000.

For governor, Smith had 1,627,000 votes; Roosevelt, 1,518,000; and Thomas, 100,000; total, 3,245,000.

Eleven thousand presidential votes had therefore no choice for governor. Assuming these were on the Coolidge ballots, there were then 1,809,000 Coolidge ballots which voted for a governor, of which 1,518,000 were for Roosevelt and 291,000 for Smith.

Thomas, the Socialist, got 100,000 of LA FOLLETTE'S Socialist votes, which leaves 386,000 that went to Smith; 950,000 Davis votes went to Smith.

Smith votes on La Follette ballots.....	386,000
Smith votes on Davis ballots.....	950,000
Smith votes on Coolidge ballots.....	291,000

Total.....	1,627,000
------------	-----------

So that both the presidential ballots and the votes for governor clearly prove that there were 291,000 "Cal and Al" votes recorded.

In other words, about 145,000 of Al's Tammany alleged Democrats voted for a stand-pat Republican (Coolidge) against a Democratic presidential candidate (Davis), and about 145,000 stand-pat Coolidge Republicans voted for a Tammany Democrat for governor against a Progressive Republican (Roosevelt).

About 145,000 of Al's Tammany supporters preferred a stand-pat Republican to a Democrat.

About 145,000 of Cal's stand-pat Republicans preferred a Democrat (Al) to a Progressive Republican.

Party principles cut no figure. It was not principle but political pie that controlled.

Except for this corrupt trading of votes, Roosevelt would have had 1,518,000 plus 145,000, or 1,663,000 votes; and Smith would have had 1,627,000 minus 145,000, or 1,482,000. Thus the pretended invincible Smith would have been defeated even for the governorship by 181,000 votes. It is on this doubly discreditable foundation that the political myth of Alfred E. Smith being able to carry New York for the Presidency has been built up. Except for this fraud he would have lost even the governorship, and if, like Davis, Smith had been running for the Presidency, he would not only not have gained 145,000 votes but far worse; he would have lost another 145,000 and only had 1,338,000 votes, and been defeated by Coolidge 482,000, even if he had gotten 386,000 LA FOLLETTE votes, or, failing this vote, would have been defeated by 868,000.

Except for this fraud Coolidge would have had 1,820,000, less 145,000, or 1,675,000—only a few more than his Republican colleague, Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., as in reason we should expect.

About 145,000 Coolidge Republicans thus bore witness, in voting for Alfred E. Smith, to his unfitness to lead Jeffersonian Democrats, and about 145,000 stand-pat Tammanyites, in voting for Coolidge, bore witness to Tammany's unfitness to lead the national democracy.

The Democratic candidate, Davis, for the Presidency, was thus betrayed by Al's friends in 1924.

In the four counties of New York, Kings, Queens, and the Bronx, the tiger's den, this treachery is most conspicuous (see World Almanac, 1928, pp. 842, 846). For here Smith got 913,000 while his Democratic colleague, Davis, got only 473,000. If Davis had got all the other presidential votes except Coolidge's, he would have gotten 285,340 additional, or a total of 758,020, showing that Smith in the tiger's den got 200,000 over his Democratic colleague, Davis, and Coolidge got over 200,000 over his Republican colleague, Roosevelt. So that in the tiger's own den there was a trade of a 100,000 votes from Al to Cal and from Cal to Al. The governorship was worth the Presidency to Tammany. They knew exactly what they wanted and got it. Therefore, "Cal and Al."

The Coolidge vote in these four counties was 608,103; the Roosevelt vote 404,116.

In 1920 the trading of votes in New York State between the Tammany supporters and the stand-pat Republican machine was still more monumental. For, in these same four counties Alfred E. Smith got 356,000 more than his Democratic colleague, Cox, and the Republican, Harding, got 389,000 more votes than his Republican colleague, Miller. In New York State, in 1920, Smith got 480,000 over his Democratic colleague, Cox, and Harding got 500,000 more than his Republican colleague, Miller. (Thirty-one thousand presidential voters had no choice for governor.) It is again clear that in 1920, about 240,000 of Smith's supporters voted for the Republican presidential candidate and about 240,000 of the Harding Republicans withdrew their votes from the Republican, Miller, and gave them to the Democrat, Smith. Even under this handicap, of a fraudulent vote of 480,000 to Miller's disadvantage, he defeated Smith.

In 1920 and in 1924, Tammany wanted the governorship of New York and the Republican machine wanted the Presidency of the United States, and got it, as far as the New York electoral vote was concerned, by the simple expedient of trading votes with Al Smith's supporters.

Unfortunately for the political myth of Al Smith, it is entirely clear that this political cooperation and exchange is not reversible.

In 1928 Tammany will need the governorship of New York as urgently as in 1920 and 1924, and will be compelled to pay the price of giving Tammany's votes to the Republican machine, in exchange for Republican machine votes to "Dear old Tammany" for the governorship.

In 1928 the Republicans will urgently need the New York electoral vote and will be willing to sell the governorship to Tammany for it, but it will not sell the Presidency, even if Tammany might desire it. But Tammany must absolutely have the governorship of New York, for its whole commercialized structure of politics depends on the control of New York City and New York State.

With iron logic, it follows, that Al Smith can not overcome the 384,000 over-all majority of Coolidge, in 1924, plus the La Follette presidential vote of 386,000. If Smith could be actually nominated, he would be in the same plight as Davis was in 1924.

In 1924 Tammany got out 95 per cent of the vote in New York City and environs, and had no reserve vote, while the up-State New York registration shows that over 500,000 registered voters did not vote. They were largely dries, who had no choice between Roosevelt and Smith,

both of whom were wet. As the Republicans will nominate a dry for President, Smith would have to overcome this additional handicap.

Nothing has occurred to add to Al Smith's strength since 1924. He is no wetter now than he was then. Much has occurred to weaken him through the sweeping reorganization of the old powerful prohibition forces, the churches, and the women, the law enforcement league, etc. They regard Alfred E. Smith as a nullificationist, as well as a wringing wet, because of his approval of the act of 1920, legalizing light wines and beers in New York State, an act which the Supreme Court of the United States declared was unconstitutional; because of his support of the plank of the Democratic State platform, proposing that Congress should violate the Constitution of the United States by modifying the Volstead Act with an amendment, allowing light wines and beer; and because, above all, of his withdrawal of the State of New York from the support of the Volstead Act by his approving the repeal of the Mullan-Gage law. Governor Smith can not carry New York, much less overcome the 7,000,000 national handicap of 1924.

The corrupt history of Tammany, under Tweed, Crocker, and Murphy, and its record of commercialized politics, makes it impossible to conceive that the American people would turn the White House over to Tammany, or deliver the United States Treasury to Tammany's wild Indians.

Be it forever remembered by those Democrats, whose thinkers still think, that never have the Democrats carried a national election except when it defied the vicious commercialized leadership of Tammany, as it did when Tilden ran and was elected; when Grover Cleveland three times denounced Tammany and was three times nominated and twice elected; and when Woodrow Wilson, vigorously opposed by Tammany, was twice nominated and twice elected.

The Democrats can not hope to carry New York or the country until it purges itself of Tammany, with its evil repute, and nominates an untainted Jeffersonian Democrat with no Hamiltonian stripes who will be acceptable to those who favor law enforcement and the national constitutional prohibition policy.

The Democrats tried to compromise in 1920 and 1924 and met two terrible defeats. Naturally, for the conservatives preferred Harding to Cox, and Coolidge to Davis, while the progressives felt no enthusiasm for Cox or for Davis, and the dries were alienated from both these gentlemen (who now appear in the public prints as approving the wringing wet Smith).

Thinking Democrats, whose thinkers still think, should not be misled by the lavishly financed campaign to sell Tammany to the Democracy. This wholesale use of money, with its agents traversing every State in the Union, writing books and magazine articles, filling the public press, using the moving pictures and the radio, and telling the impoverished Democracy that if Smith is nominated they need not worry about financing the campaign, should be a warning of the real powers behind this Tammany movement.

The Democracy must fight these powers or fail in its duty and opportunity.

The cheapest way to insure the election of a Republican in 1928 is to finance and nominate Smith. The Republican politicians know it, and commend Smith with more cordiality than sincerity, because they know that if the Democrats can be split on the wet issue, on the Tammany issue, on the nullification issue, on immigration, or on a religious issue, Democratic defeat is a certainty.

Governor Smith can not carry New York in 1928.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I notice in an address by the distinguished Senator from Ohio to the G. O. P. women open school, in training Republican speakers—

Mr. CARAWAY. Which Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Fess, not the Senator from that State who is a candidate for the Presidency; at least, he has not come out yet as a candidate. I notice that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Fess] wanted to get away from the new-found issues, so he said to tell the country that the Republican Party abolished slavery and preserved the Union.

I received that in a letter this morning, and I would like to have the inclosed letter read from the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The inclosed clipping is from yesterday afternoon's Washington Times. Do you not think it would be a most appropriate thing for the Republican men to follow up the women's "School of politics" with a postgraduate course in the finer points of the game?

For example, a program something like the following would doubtless prove helpful to the unsophisticated voters this fall:

"The oily bird snatches the term," by Harry F. Sinclair.

"Oil's well that spends well," by Will Hays.

"Proper lubrication for run-down party machinery," by the official spokesman for the Grand "Oil" Party.

"How to keep party secrets," by Andrew Mellon, in collaboration with William M. Butler.

"Bonds of political friendship," by Albert B. Fall.

"The relationship between leases and greases as applied to party deficits," by Harry F. Sinclair.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, some time ago I was asked to appear before what is called a school of women and talk on the history of the Republican Party. I had no embarrassment whatever in accepting an invitation to talk on that subject. Of course, it goes without saying that no man or woman would be brave enough to talk on the history of the Democratic Party, and that is the basis of their criticism.

Mr. FLETCHER. In connection with some remarks made this morning, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Philadelphia Record of March 19, 1928.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Record, March 19, 1928]

NO ADEQUATE ATONEMENT FOR CORRUPT DEEDS

It is not surprising that Senator BORAH's great scheme for repudiating past iniquities connected with the oil scandal by presenting that poor millionaire, Harry F. Sinclair, with a check for \$160,000 seems to be making poor headway. Most people, indeed, are clearheaded enough to see that this is not an adequate form of repentance for sins of commission. The evil has been done, and the return to Sinclair of some of the money he put up for the Republican National Committee will have no ethical significance. Probably he will be glad enough to receive the contribution with a chuckle, but that will not absolve ex-Chairman Will H. Hays and others connected with the committee, and back of them the leaders of the party, from all blame for this disgusting moral turpitude.

If the G. O. P. as a whole has any compunction over past misdeeds, including the bribery of a Cabinet officer and the betrayal of the Government's first line of defense, the way to show it is to disown everybody connected with this most discreditable affair and to refuse to support an organization that is largely under the same influences as in 1921. There must be an end to this wholesale buying and a return to common honesty. An independent expression of opinion on this subject appears in the New York Times, which, under the heading "They must turn a new leaf," says in part:

"Now the country is seeing to what dishonest equivocations and shifts—some frankly dishonorable and some inconsistent with any delicate sense of honor—the party management, with the knowledge of eminent Republicans of unblemished name, has resorted. The size of Republican campaign funds, their methods of collection and use have long bred suspicion and often scandal. In the last two campaigns no money was really needed. Yet the Republican fat friers spent millions for nothing; got into a hole, 'touched' pitch, and for years succeeded in covering up their tracks.

"We take it that wealthy Republicans are now pretty well scared and that many of them will be mighty chary with their checks to the collectors of 'soap.' We take it, too, that there is common sense enough among influential Republicans not to fall again into that violent and repeated bleeding of purses which has brought the party into such doubt and fear and disgusted such a multitude of Republicans. Reform may come too late; but it must come. The thinner the campaign chest is the better. The collection and the accounting must be straightforward and aboveboard. Even then there will be much incredulity.

"The talk of restitution is nonsense. There must be reform, repentance, and works meet for repentance. The time is short. The score of excess, the ancient blackmail, suspicion, and evidence of crookedness are intolerably long. Students of the punishment of the wicked will notice cynically that transactions which in 'the best days of the party' would have been considered rather a good joke, perhaps to be boasted of at a dinner, now sicken the public conscience and give gooseflesh even to politicians of known easiness of moral digestion. The oil flowed along. People seemed to get used to it, and nobody but the Democrats to mind it. Is the oil getting afire? That is the thought that wrinkles august brows."

The sins of the Republican bosses can not be wiped out by sending checks for \$1 and \$2 to Senator BORAH.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I send to the desk a clipping from an Ohio paper which came to me this morning, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

[From the Akron Beacon-Journal, March 19, 1928]

"FENCES"

It must have been an embarrassing moment for Mr. Will Hays, good Presbyterian and apostle of the idea of unselfish service, when he heard himself likened in the United States Senate to a "fence," the outlaw class that makes a business of aiding thieves in the profitable distribution of stolen goods.

But political honors are easy in the "fence" business. Senator WALSH's probe committee has discovered Wilbur C. Marsh, former treasurer of the National Democratic Committee, of having accepted his own large share

of Sinclair and Doheny contributions and making a sinister bargain with Mr. Hays, his brother fence on the other side, to keep the fact of the giving to either party forever a secret from the country. This thing was done upon the heels of a Democratic National Convention of which the sacramental Mr. Doheny was a chairman and the maker of a keynote speech. It was happening, too, in the campaign in which the Hon. James M. Cox, the nominee, was berating the big interests for "trying to buy an underhold on American government."

Let us hope that now that the smeary trail of oil leads into Democratic headquarters, that Senator WALSH will lose no zest for investigation. Hitherto it has proceeded at its best clip when the fair names of Republican angels of the Hays type were attainted with scandalous association with campaign graft.

If WALSH will follow the trail wherever it may lead, the country will engage to deal with the political "fences." By contrast with Fagin the latter loses something of popular contempt. Fagin made no pretense of uplift and high-mindedness. He did not rhapsodize over patriotism and service.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, it seems remarkable that so many misstatements of fact concerning proceedings before the committee now investigating the Continental bonds could possibly creep into so short a statement in any newspaper. It says:

Senator WALSH's probe committee has discovered Wilbur C. Marsh, former treasurer of the National Democratic Committee, of having accepted his own large share of Sinclair and Doheny contributions, and making a sinister bargain with Mr. Hays, his brother fence on the other side, to keep the fact of the giving to either party forever a secret from the country.

Mr. President, I desire to say that the so-called Walsh probe committee has discovered nothing of the kind. In the first place the committee has not discovered that either Mr. Doheny or Mr. Sinclair made any contributions to the Democratic committee; that is to say, the investigation now in progress has not discovered anything of the kind. The investigation which was conducted four years ago disclosed that Mr. Sinclair testified that he made a contribution to the Democratic committee, but the responsible officers of the Democratic committee came before the investigating committee and denied that Mr. Sinclair had ever made a contribution to the Democratic National Committee, and it was afterwards explained that perhaps it was a contribution to some State committee.

As to Mr. Doheny, he testified that he made a contribution of \$75,000 to the Democratic campaign committee and \$25,000 to the Republican campaign committee. But the chairman of the Democratic committee came before the investigating committee and testified that Mr. Doheny's total contributions to the Democratic campaign committee were \$34,000.

Mr. PITTMAN. What year was that?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That was in 1920. His contribution of \$25,000, the last contribution being made in April, 1921, was a contribution to help make up the deficit.

Now, as to the information secured by the investigating committee that former Treasurer Marsh had entered into a sinister bargain to keep these contributions secret, the fact about the matter is that whatever was said with respect to that matter was concerning an agreement made by Mr. Marsh in the year 1923. Mr. Doheny's contributions had all been made in 1920 and 1921. The evidence before the committee leads them to believe that Mr. Sinclair never made any contribution. Whatever agreement was made by Mr. Marsh, if any agreement at all was made, had no relation whatever to either the Doheny or the Sinclair contribution.

But, Mr. President, what are the facts concerning this remarkable discovery by the committee? The committee examined two clerks in the office of Mr. Upham, the treasurer of the Republican National Committee, and interrogated them concerning every transaction of which they had any knowledge whatever, and generally they told us they had no knowledge whatever about any of the transactions. But when the committee got to Chicago these two gentlemen remembered something about this alleged agreement, and what was it? They testified that they were told by Mr. Upham, who is now dead, that he had an agreement of that kind with Mr. Marsh. Mr. Marsh was on the stand this morning before the investigating committee. He testified that after getting through with the campaign in 1920 he was taken from New York to his home in the State of Iowa on a stretcher, suffering from an illness which forbade him ever after to have anything at all to do with the duties of his office, and he had nothing at all to do with the duties of his office; that they passed into other hands after that time; that he had a pleasant acquaintance with Mr. Upham, met him casually on the street or somewhere else, but never had any appointment with him, never any engagement with him, never made any such agreement with Mr.

Upham, and that there was no occasion for his making any such agreement because he had, of course, in the state of his health, determined that he would not again be treasurer of the Democratic National Committee; and having made his report in 1922, no report was due from anybody until October, 1924, under the law. So that there was no occasion for his entering into any such agreement with Mr. Upham.

Mr. GLASS. Then the Senator may well state further that there was no occasion for him to enter into any such agreement, because there was no contribution to the campaign fund of the Democratic committee that was big enough to conceal. In fact, there was not one big enough to discover.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The article continues:

This thing was done—

That is, the agreement between Upham and Marsh—

This thing was done upon the heels of a Democratic national convention of which the sacramental Mr. Doheny was a chairman and the maker of a keynote speech.

Mr. Doheny was indeed a delegate from the State of California to the Democratic National Convention in San Francisco in 1920. He was not chairman of anything so far as my recollection goes. He certainly was not chairman of the convention, either temporary or permanent, and he made no keynote speech.

The article then continues:

Let us hope that now that the smeary trail of oil leads into Democratic headquarters that Senator WALSH will lose no zest for investigation.

I think that every member of the committee, every Senator who has ever been a member of the committee, will attest to the statement that Senator WALSH has never indicated any hesitancy to follow the inquiry into any channels into which it might legitimately lead, whoever might be affected by the revelations, or whatever might be the politics of any man whose connection with the transaction might have been disclosed. Senator WALSH has repeatedly refused to go into wholly extraneous matters foreign from the fields into which the committee was directed to go by order of the Senate, but the imputation that I have at any time halted lest Democratic officials should in any wise be involved is a slander.

I send to the desk an editorial from the St. Louis Times-Star on another but not unrelated subject and ask that it be read from the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

[From the St. Louis Star, Monday, March 19, 1928]

A MILLION FOR PROPAGANDA

It is possible that defeat of the original Walsh resolution for a Senate investigation of the public-utility combines got these combines into a worse mess with the Federal Trade Commission, which is conducting the investigation. The commission's first report discloses, among other things, that the National Electric Light Association, supported by the various utility units, collects more than a million dollars a year from that source for lobbying, propaganda, and other activities. Evidently it is money well spent—from the utility companies' standpoint. Was the Senate influenced by this propaganda in acting on the Walsh proposal? At least a quarter of the annual contribution was spent to "educate" public opinion against public operation of utilities the report shows.

The million-a-year fund, of course, came ultimately from the utility companies' customers. It was collected in the form of rates. Those rates are sanctioned in most States by a public-utility commission. Before the utilities are permitted to charge the rates they are required to make some showing of expenses. How were the contributions of individual companies to this vast national fund accounted for? How much of this money was contributed by utility concerns in Missouri, if any? What excuse, if any, was made for this expense? Did the commission check these accounts at all?

A million dollars a year for propaganda on any one subject is a vast amount. If used in a bad cause it might create a deluded public sentiment in favor of that cause. The Trade Commission report shows that in 1923, \$90,000 was given for a research staff at Harvard University on public-utility management, and that at the University of Colorado 17 lecturers in a public-utility course were officials of public-utility companies. They at least had no prejudice in favor of municipal ownership.

Something needs revising when public utilities can raise a fund of that size for such purposes while operating under State regulation. Evidently expense statements are not being closely scrutinized or sufficiently blue-pencilled by public officials whose duty is, or ought to be, to see where the utility companies' money goes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I wish to read and have made, therefore, a part of the Record something in the same line that

has been suggested by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] in one of the communications which he has presented to the Senate. It might be well, in the investigation that is now being undertaken by the Federal Trade Commission, that they include these communications in their investigation and ascertain the amount of money that has been derived from the sources indicated thereby.

I read first, sir, a letter from Milton W. Harrison, president of the National Association of Owners of Railroad and Public Utility Securities, and I call the attention of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] and the other Members of this body to the peculiar purposes to which a very large fund is sought to be devoted, a fund which, if collected as desired by those responsible for these communications, will rival any fund for propaganda that has ever been collected in the United States.

11 EAST THIRTY-SIXTH STREET,
New York, N. Y., February 10, 1928.

DEAR SIR:—

I am reading from a photostatic copy of the letter which has been circulated in the State of California, sent to every investor and stockholder there, as I understand it. The photostatic copies have been sent me by the Fresno Bee, a newspaper of standing, character, importance, and wide influence. The letter proceeds:

It is highly important that investors in electric power and light, gas, and street railway companies should cooperate to safeguard their interests against unsound public discussion and unwise legislation.

Mark these words, "unsound public discussion" and "unwise legislation"!

That is, sir, as I interpret the language, that it is most important to these investors to protect themselves against free speech regarding public utilities; against any criticism; against forsooth, "unsound public discussion." The letter proceeds:

To effect such cooperation, the National Association of Owners of Railroad and Public Utility Securities has enlarged its scope and is soliciting your membership.

Investors in railroad securities have been united for years through the association, and have effectually sustained their interests as security owners before legislators and administrative officials. With other public utilities now under sharp discussion, with a senatorial investigation in prospect, and with considerable agitation for public ownership under way, the time is at hand when holders of utility securities must unite in order that their views and interests may be brought to public attention.

The National Association of Owners of Railroad and Public Utility Securities represents the interests of the investor in public discussion of the utilities and will carry forward a campaign designed to inform the public of the extent to which all citizens, whether security holders or not, are directly concerned in maintaining the welfare of public utilities and the soundness of the securities issued by them.

It will be clear to you that our views and our aims will be short in their weight unless we are strongly united in enunciating them. We count on your cooperation. An indorsement membership blank is on the reverse of this sheet. Your prompt return of it in the attached addressed envelope will be sincerely appreciated.

One dollar is the individual membership fee.

Very truly yours,

MILTON W. HARRISON, President.

Connected with that, sir, and sent to the small subscribers to public-utility stock in the State of California is a letter from doubtless an excellent brokerage house of the city of San Francisco, Peirce, Fair & Co., sponsoring the association and the demand.

In addition to that, I ask to have printed as a part of my remarks, without reading, an editorial appearing in the Sacramento and Fresno Bees upon the subject and calling attention to these letters.

The one thing that I want to make plain is that if every subscriber, every stockholder, in a public-utility corporation—and they are now innumerable in the States where the campaign has been carried on to get bookkeepers, stenographers, and all sorts of people to buy one share of stock under the plea that they would thus be participating in a great utility business—if \$1 shall be subscribed by all these people, a fund will be created that will beggar description and will be greater in amount, probably, than any propaganda fund that has ever been raised in this Nation. It will be devoted to what purpose? To prevent, as these utilities say, "unsound public discussion." Just think of it, sir, unsound public discussion will be precluded by a slush fund that will exceed in its aggregate any that has been brought out either by the Walsh investigating committee or in other fashion. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Sacramento and Fresno Bees upon the subject—and the Bees, I may remark, are perhaps the most independent and cer-

tainly among the most important and most influential journals in the State of California—together with the letter from Peirce, Fair & Co., may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEIWER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Sacramento and Fresno (Calif.) Bees]

MILLIONS BEGGED OF UTILITY INVESTORS TO FIGHT LEGISLATION—NATIONAL BODY ASKS FOR \$1 FROM EACH SHAREHOLDER TO MUZZLE "UN SOUND PUBLIC DISCUSSION," SAFEGUARD "UNWISE AND ILL-ADVISED LAWS," AND ADD MORE POWER TO LOBBY INFLUENCE

Contribute \$1 to gag legislators and prevent State and Federal investigation of public utilities and thus safeguard your utility investments.

Your \$1, added to those of all the other holders of utility stocks and bonds in the United States, will make a pot containing millions of dollars with which to fight "ill-advised legislation," and a lot of sinews of war can be purchased with that much money.

BUILDING A POT OF GOLD

Such is the appeal being made to utility stockholders in California by an organization known as the National Association of Owners of Railroad and Public Utility Securities, and it is as bold and brazen in its request for slush funds as the corrupt corporations of old ever dared to be.

The public utilities do not want any Federal investigation made of their affairs. In fact, just such an attempt was headed off a few days ago when the Senate voted down WALSH's resolution to throw a Federal spotlight on the power utilities.

PURPOSES PLAINLY GIVEN

But the utilities would now shift the cost of such "safeguarding" to the shoulders of the individual stockholders, and hence they have appealed to them to contribute a dollar to the cause. The corporations make no effort to conceal the purposes to which this dollar will go. They put it down on paper so there will be no doubt.

WHAT THE DOLLAR WILL BUY

Here are some of the things this dollar, with the millions of others, is expected to buy:

- Protection against unsound public discussion.
- Protection against unwise legislation.
- Dissemination of utility views to public.
- Protection against public ownership.
- Protection against utility assaults.
- Added power and influence to utilities lobby.

APPEALS CONTAINED IN LETTERS

The foregoing plans of raising sinews of war with which to fight public inquiry are included in two letters sent out to power company stockholders in the district. Whether stockholders in all power companies received them is not known, but they have appeared in Fresno.

The key letter is from the National Association of Owners of Railroad and Public Utility Securities. It is accompanied by another appeal from a San Francisco stock and bond house.

THE KEY LETTER

The association letter follows:

"DEAR SIR: It is highly important that investors in electric power and light, gas, and street-railway companies should cooperate to safeguard their interests against unsound public discussion and unwise legislation. To effect such cooperation the National Association of Owners of Railroad and Public Utility Securities has enlarged its scope and is soliciting your membership.

"Investors in railroad securities have been united for years through the association, and have effectually sustained their interests as security owners before legislators and administrative officials. With other public utilities now under sharp discussion, with a senatorial investigation in prospect, and with considerable agitation for public ownership under way, the time is at hand when holders of utility securities must unite in order that their views and interests may be brought to public attention.

"The National Association of Owners of Railroad and Public Utility Securities represents the interests of the investor in public discussion of the utilities and will carry forward a campaign designed to inform the public of the extent to which all citizens, whether security holders or not, are directly concerned in maintaining the welfare of public utilities and the soundness of the securities issued by them.

"It will be clear to you that our views and our aims will be short in their weight unless we are strongly united in enunciating them. We count on your cooperation. An indorsement membership blank is on the reverse of this sheet. Your prompt return of it in the attached addressed envelope will be sincerely appreciated. One dollar is the individual membership fee.

"Very truly yours,

"MILTON W. HARRISON, President."

FEBRUARY 10, 1928.

CLIENTS URGED TO JOIN

The brokerage-house letter emphasizes the reason for the solicitation in the following language:

"To Our Clients:

"We inclose herewith copy of a communication from Milton W. Harrison, president of the National Association of Owners of Railroad and Public Utility Securities (Inc.). This association represents an enlarged scope of the National Association of Owners of Railroad Securities, an organization that has been in existence for many years.

"The association provides an adequate and greatly needed representation for the owners of public utility securities in the United States. You will realize that such an association, speaking for millions of security holders throughout the country, is in a strong position to protect its members against many assaults, including ill-advised legislation. It also brings to the attention of its members matters of importance which require their attention, thought, and action.

"The sponsorship of the association is assurance of its efficiency.

"We believe in the association's campaign to increase its membership. Each added member gives so much added power and influence to the association and so much more assistance in the protection that the association can give to its members. We indorse the purposes and management of the association and recommend that serious consideration be given by all public utility security holders to this association and accordingly to its campaign to increase its membership.

"PEIRCE, FAIR & Co."

FEBRUARY 11, 1928.

MILLIONS COULD BE RAISED

An idea of what great proportions this pot of gold could reach if even a bare majority of the power, gas, and street-railway company stockholders dropped in their dollar can be had when it is realized there are 190,248 stockholders in the California power companies alone. According to figures obtained from the State railroad commission these stockholders are divided as follows:

Great Western Power Co., 11,607; San Joaquin Light & Power Co., 14,180; Pacific Gas & Electric, 39,149; Southern California Edison, 115,419; Western States Gas & Electric, 3,031; California-Oregon Power, 2,731; San Diego Consolidated Gas & Electric, 3,502.

The distribution of the association letter, however, is doubtless nation-wide, and its appeal, if answered, could easily raise millions of dollars.

SAN FRANCISCO, February 11, 1928.

To Our Clients:

We inclose herewith copy of a communication from Mr. Milton W. Harrison, president of the National Association of Owners of Railroad and Public Utility Securities (Inc.). This association represents an enlarged scope of the National Association of Owners of Railroad Securities, an organization that has been in existence for many years.

The association provides an adequate and greatly needed representation for the owners of public utility securities in the United States. You will realize that such an association, speaking for millions of security holders throughout the country, is in a strong position to protect its members against many assaults, including ill-advised legislation. It also brings to the attention of its members matters of importance which require their attention, thought, and action.

The sponsorship of the association is assurance of its efficiency.

We believe in the association's campaign to increase its membership. Each added member gives so much added power and influence to the association and so much more assistance in the protection that the association can give to its members. We indorse the purposes and management of the association and recommend that serious consideration be given by all public utility security holders to this association and accordingly to its campaign to increase its membership.

PEIRCE, FAIR & Co.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has supplemented the editorial from the St. Louis Star which I had read from the desk. Very little attention was paid to the reading of it on the floor, and so I feel justified in calling attention to the fact that it discloses that the public-utility associations in the United States, according to information that has come to the Federal Trade Commission, spent a million dollars last year for educational purposes. The sinister thing about the matter is that they are subsidizing lecturers and professors in the various colleges of the country to instill into the minds of the youth there assembled their peculiar views concerning public questions in which they are more or less directly interested. To what extent this educational campaign is responsible for any sentiment that may exist in the country at the present time against public ownership as a policy is a matter of speculation, and speculation only. But the people who provide these funds are careful and conservative business men; they have not made an invest-

ment of a million dollars without expecting substantial returns in the shape of the public sentiment which they expect to develop.

THE COPLEY PRESS (INC.)

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. John Callan O'Laughlin to Hon. William E. Humphrey, chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, relating to some incidents that occurred here within the last day or two. I ask that the letter may be printed in the RECORD in fairness to Mr. O'Laughlin, who is a journalist, it is true, but a journalist in the very highest sense and one who in a long career in journalism has won the respect, regard, admiration, and affection of all those who know him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). Without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter referred to is as follows:

[Copy of letter sent to-day to Federal Trade Commission]

COPLEY PRESS (INC.), AURORA, ILL.,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1928.

HON. WILLIAM E. HUMPHREY,

Chairman Federal Trade Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg to call your attention to the remarks in the United States Senate of Senator NORRIS, as printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 4874 and 4875 of the issue of Friday, March 16, 1928, and pages 4954, 4955, and 4956 of the issue of Monday, March 19, 1928.

Mr. NORRIS, on page 4875 of the said RECORD, read a letter from an unnamed person, whom he described as "superintendent of the municipal waterworks at Springfield, Ill.," wherein slanderous statements are made relative to Mr. Ira C. Copley and his purchases of various newspapers and to alleged contemplated purchases by him. The letter concludes:

"How far this newspaper monopoly will go nobody knows; but it is, indeed, a menace, and an investigation which would show the actual financial support behind this venture would undoubtedly reveal a direct utility connection and would be a splendid and far-reaching contribution toward the protection of the public."

Mr. NORRIS concluded his remarks by referring the matter in respect of Mr. Copley to the Federal Trade Commission "for proper investigation."

On March 19 Mr. NORRIS sought to explain his reference to the Los Angeles Express, and quoted a letter to him from the undersigned demanding that the investigation as to Mr. Copley's acquisitions be pushed to the fullest extent and insisting that he present all the evidence or information in his possession which might directly or indirectly relate to such alleged connections (i. e., between Mr. Copley's newspaper acquisitions and the financing of public-utility corporations).

The additional "evidence" presented by Mr. NORRIS comprised a public advertisement dated March 7, 1928, for a bond issue for Copley Press (Inc.), attached hereto, which set forth the details of the offering and the purpose of employment of the proceeds thereof; and extracts from a copy of a newspaper published in Los Angeles, known as the Open Forum. That paper is published by the southern California branch of the American Civil Liberties Union and is extremely radical. It has openly expressed sympathy with anarchists, socialists, and the soviet government. Its editors are Upton Sinclair, whose record is well known, and other pronounced socialists. Undoubtedly Mr. NORRIS did not realize the character of the source of the emanations which he spread upon the records of the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS repeated loose and false statements reflecting upon the honor and integrity of Mr. Copley and his purpose in acquiring papers in addition to those he has owned for many years.

In view of these statements and the objectionable and unfounded insinuations made, Copley Press (Inc.) respectfully requests the Federal Trade Commission to give immediate consideration to the subject matter of the remarks of the said Senator NORRIS. The commission unquestionably will realize, as do all fair-minded men, that slander to be crushed must be dealt with instantly; and it is in the firm conviction that this is the attitude of the commission that Copley Press (Inc.) urges disposition of the matter at once.

Copley Press (Inc.) will be glad, if the commission so pleases, to furnish all its records and correspondence, files of the papers since Mr. Copley purchased them, to produce witnesses, and, in short, to give the utmost cooperation to any inquiry it deems it desirable to make.

Very respectfully,

JOHN CALLAN O'LAUGHLIN,
Vice President Copley Press (Inc.).

RECREATION PIER, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1665) to authorize the board of park commissioners of the city and county of San Francisco to construct a recreation pier at the foot of Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, Calif., which

was, on page 2, line 5, after the word "Service," to insert "and prior to use of said recreation pier by the city of San Francisco."

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ENFORCEMENT OF NARCOTIC DRUGS ACTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 10083) to provide for advances of funds by special disbursing agents in connection with the enforcement of acts relating to narcotic drugs, was read twice by its title.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I would like to have the Chair hold the bill at the desk. I think a similar Senate bill has been passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state for the information of the Senator from Utah and for the information of the Senate that yesterday the Senate passed an identical bill prior to the reception of this bill from the House.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I think I can satisfy the Senator in a moment if he will permit me. I was about to state that the House had passed a companion bill with certain amendments. I have made inquiry and I find that those amendments are entirely satisfactory to the department. Therefore I move that the Senate reconsider the votes whereby we ordered to a third reading and passed the bill (S. 3311) to provide for advances of funds by special disbursing agents in connection with the enforcement of acts relating to narcotic drugs.

Mr. JONES. Is the bill here or has it gone to the House?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill has not been messaged to the House. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I ask now that the Senate bill be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I now ask for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 10083) to provide for advances of funds by special disbursing agents in connection with the enforcing of acts relating to narcotic drugs.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Prohibition, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized to direct the advance of funds by special disbursing agents in connection with the enforcement of the act entitled "An act to provide for the registration of, with collectors of internal revenue, and to impose a special tax upon, all persons who produce, import, manufacture, compound, deal in, dispense, sell, distribute, or give away opium or cocoa leaves, their salts, derivatives, or preparations, and for other purposes," approved December 17, 1914, as amended by the revenue act of 1918, and the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes,' approved February 9, 1909," as amended by the act of May 26, 1922, known as "the narcotic drugs import and export act."

Such advances in connection with the enforcement of the acts hereinabove stated relating to narcotic drugs may be made, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (sec. 529, title 31, U. S. Code), from the appropriations available for the enforcement of such acts and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1271) to more effectively meet the obligations of the United States under the migratory bird treaty with Great Britain by lessening the dangers threatening migratory game birds from drainage and other causes, by the acquisition of areas of land and of water to furnish in perpetuity reservations for the adequate protection of such birds, and by providing funds for the establishment of such areas, their maintenance and improvement, and for other purposes.

Mr. DILL. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the pending bill, and I should like to have it read and printed so that it may be available in printed form to-morrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Fess in the chair). The clerk will read the amendment for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 11, after line 11, it is proposed to insert the following as a new section:

SEC. —. That \$1,000,000 of the \$1,500,000 authorized to be appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States for the purchase of refuges for wild life and fish as provided in section 10 of an act to establish the Upper Mississippi River Wild Life and Fish Refuge, approved June 7, 1924, is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States for the purchase or rental by the commission at the price or prices fixed by the commission for migratory-bird reservations as provided in this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

The question is on the committee amendment on page 5, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 10, on page 5, line 18, after the word "or," it is proposed to insert "occupy or use any part thereof," so as to make the section read:

SEC. 10. That no person shall take any bird, or nest, or egg thereof, or knowingly disturb, injure, or destroy any notice, signboard, fence, building, ditch, dam, dike, embankment, flume, spillway, or other improvement or property of the United States on any area acquired under this act, or cut, burn, or destroy any timber, grass, or other natural growth, on said area or on any area of the United States which heretofore has been or which hereafter may be set apart or reserved for the use of the Department of Agriculture as a game refuge or as a preserve or reservation and breeding ground for native birds, under any law, proclamation, or Executive order, or occupy or use any part thereof, or enter thereon for any purpose, except in accordance with regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture; but nothing in this act or in any regulation thereunder shall be construed to prevent a person from entering upon any area acquired under this act for the purpose of fishing in accordance with the law of the State in which such area is located: *Provided*, That such person complies with the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture covering such area.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, just a second. I had the floor last night when the Senate recessed, and I do not want the RECORD to show that any amendment has been agreed to at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be considered as being open.

Mr. REED of Missouri. I had the floor last night, and I yielded this morning in order to permit the interesting discussion which has taken place. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum being suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Edwards	McMaster	Shortridge
Barkley	Fess	McNary	Simmons
Bayard	Fletcher	Mayfield	Smith
Bingham	Frazier	Metcalf	Smoot
Black	George	Moses	Steiwer
Blaine	Gerry	Neely	Stephens
Blease	Gillett	Norbeck	Swanson
Borah	Glass	Norris	Thomas
Bratton	Hale	Nye	Tydings
Brookhart	Harris	Overman	Tyson
Broussard	Harrison	Phipps	Wagner
Bruce	Hawes	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Capper	Hayden	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Caraway	Hefflin	Reed, Mo.	Warren
Copeland	Johnson	Reed, Pa.	Waterman
Couzens	Jones	Robinson, Ark.	Watson
Curtis	Kendrick	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler
Cutting	Keyes	Sackett	Willis
Deneen	King	Schall	
Dill	La Follette	Sheppard	
Edge	McKellar	Shipstead	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BLAINE. Mr. President—

Mr. REED of Missouri. Mr. President, on account of an engagement I am unable to proceed at this time, and I will yield to the Senator from Wisconsin. I ask, however, the privilege, when my remarks are made, of having them printed in the RECORD as though continuously made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. BLAINE addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time—

INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION AT SEVILLE, SPAIN

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me for a few minutes?

Mr. BLAINE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. I should like to call up the joint resolution this morning reported by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] by the unanimous consent of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is extremely important that it should be passed to-day if possible. It is House Joint Resolution 211. The joint resolution merely relates to the manner of expenditure of the appropriation already made for the construction of an American building at the international exposition at Seville.

Mr. NORBECK. Reserving the right to object, I will agree to its consideration if it does not lead to extended debate.

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It will not lead to any debate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator state briefly what change is proposed by the joint resolution?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. Two years ago Congress passed a law authorizing the appropriation of about \$700,000 for the construction of an American building at Seville, Spain. It has been held by the Comptroller General that the expenditure of that money for architects' fees, for example, is illegal unless the architect is present to certify to every item of expenditure in the construction of the building. The architect's fee will amount to about \$12,000. The architect who has been selected has been working on the building for about a year, and the period of construction will be 9 or 10 months more. Obviously, no architect of any practice or any reputation can afford to go to Spain and remain there superintending the construction of one small building for 9 or 10 months, yet the Comptroller General says he can not pay the architect or any contractor without this certificate.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator where is the exposition to be held?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It is the international exposition which will be held in Seville next year or the following year.

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the total appropriation?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The total appropriation made two years ago was \$700,000. It is an important exposition in which the United States and other nations are taking part.

Mr. FLETCHER. And the joint resolution does what?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. It permits the expenditure of money for the construction and the payment of architects' fees without requiring the Comptroller General to see that the architect is personally in attendance every minute.

Mr. FLETCHER. It is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. REED of Pennsylvania. The report of the Committee on Foreign Relations is unanimous.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 211) to amend Public Resolution 65, approved March 3, 1925, authorizing the participation of the United States in the international exposition to be held in Seville, Spain, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That appropriations heretofore made or hereafter to be made under the authorization of Public Resolution No. 65, approved March 3, 1925 (43 Stat. 1256), to enable the Government of the United States to participate in an international exposition at Seville, Spain, may be expended on the certificate of the Secretary of State that the employment of personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere and that the materials or services are necessary to enable the Government of the United States to participate in said exposition for the purposes enumerated in that resolution without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or of any other act regulating or limiting the expenditure of public moneys: *Provided*, That this authority shall not be construed to waive the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 445) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement or agreements with the State of Montana and private owners of lands within the State of Montana for grazing and range development, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2317) continuing for one year the powers and authority of the Federal Radio Commission under the radio act of 1927.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8725) to amend section 224 of the Judicial Code, requested a conference

with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DYER, and Mr. SUMNERS of Texas were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

PROTECTION OF MIGRATORY BIRDS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1271) to more effectively meet the obligations of the United States under the migratory-bird treaty with Great Britain by lessening the dangers threatening migratory game birds from drainage and other causes, by the acquisition of areas of land and of water to furnish in perpetuity reservations for the adequate protection of such birds, and by providing funds for the establishment of such areas, their maintenance and improvement, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLAINE resumed his speech. After having spoken, with interruptions, for nearly three hours, he said:

Mr. President, I see the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] on his feet. I am going to yield to him with the understanding that upon the convening of the Senate to-morrow I will undertake to conclude this debate so far as I am concerned. I understand that the Senator desires to move an executive session.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I will state to the Senator that we shall probably adjourn to-night, and the pending bill is not likely to come before the Senate until 2 o'clock.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Wisconsin would have the floor.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator would have the floor then.

Mr. BLAINE. A parliamentary inquiry. I will have the floor, then, at the close of the morning business, if closed by 2 o'clock, or whenever it is closed?

Mr. CURTIS. So I understand.

Mr. SWANSON. I think there is no doubt about that.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I desire to move an executive session.

Mr. BLAINE. I yield to the Senator.

[Mr. BLAINE's speech will be published entire in the RECORD of March 26.]

Mr. BROUSSARD. Mr. President—

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. BROUSSARD. I have here a document that it will take too much time to read if we are to have an executive session. Therefore, I shall ask that it be read to-morrow.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE AT OR NEAR PLATTSMOUTH, NEBR.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES in the chair). If the Senator from Kansas will withhold his motion for a moment the Chair, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DALE], asks permission to report favorably, from the Committee on Commerce, House bill 10373, and to submit a report (No. 600) thereon.

On behalf of the Senator from Vermont, the Chair asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10373) authorizing the Plattsmouth Bridge Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Plattsmouth, Nebr.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 20 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, March 22, 1928, at 12 o'clock meridian.

INTERNATIONAL RADIOTELEGRAPH CONVENTION

In executive session this day, the Senate, having had under consideration Executive B, Seventieth Congress, first session, an International Radiotelegraph Convention, and general and supplementary regulations relating thereto, signed at Washington, D. C., on November 25, 1927, advised and consented to its ratification, subject to the following understandings and conditions:

First. The words "de 160 à 194 kc/s" in the first sentence of paragraph 6 of article 19 of the general regulations, which were used through error, shall be corrected by substituting therefor the words "de 100 à 160 kc/s."

Second. The amendments adopted by the delegates in the closing session of the conference on November 25, 1927, as stated in the minutes of that meeting, including the consecutive numbering of the articles and paragraphs by the International Bureau

of the Telegraph Union, shall be incorporated into this convention and the general regulations prior to ratification thereof.

(The injunction of secrecy was removed from this convention on December 17, 1927, on motion of Mr. BORAH and by unanimous consent.)

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 21 (legislative day of March 20), 1928

MEMBER OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Frank Clark, of Florida, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring September 7, 1930, vice Edward P. Costigan, resigned.

WAR CLAIMS ARBITER

Edwin B. Parker, of Texas, to be war claims arbiter, under section 3 of the act of Congress approved March 10, 1928, entitled "Settlement of war claims act of 1928."

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Harold Louderback, of California, to be United States district judge, northern district of California. (An additional position created by the act approved March 5, 1927.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 21 (legislative day of March 20), 1928

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

To be captain

Harry E. Shoemaker.

To be commander

Charles H. Maddox.

To be lieutenant commanders

Adolph P. Schneider.

Lester J. Hudson.

To be lieutenant

David E. Carlson.

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Edward W. Young.

Arthur A. Grieser.

Neville L. McDowell.

Stone E. Bush.

To be passed assistant surgeon

Robert E. Baker.

To be passed assistant dental surgeon

Hugh E. Mauldin.

To be chief machinist

Murphy Lott.

To be chief pay clerks

Oscar H. Weyel.

Fred Traxler.

Hans C. A. Andersen.

Paul C. Davis.

Albert J. Kirsch.

Albert J. Burnett.

Ray M. Williams.

Fred W. Stilwell.

Noel O. Bickham.

Dee A. Barnett.

William J. Vay.

Roy H. Thompson.

Henry H. Hoefs.

Otto D. Bierling.

George L. Von Mohnlein.

Henry A. Oswald.

John W. Hall.

Clarence B. Selden.

Glenn P. Hardy.

John H. O'Neill.

POSTMASTERS

ILLINOIS

Rose S. Beard, Arenzville.

Robert N. Bragg, Brimfield.

Edward F. Tedens, Lemont.

Arthur F. Sturgis, Middletown.

IOWA

Edward E. Simpson, Nashua.

Kenneth E. Lewis, Williamsburg.

KENTUCKY

Fannie R. Williams, Pikeville.

LOUISIANA

Lavinia A. Parr, Baldwin.

Lillian D. Gayle, Independence.

MAINE

Bernard V. Thompson, Easton.

Harold C. Gates, Millinocket.

MARYLAND

John W. Brittingham, Pittsville.

MICHIGAN

Arthur R. Gerow, Cheboygan.
William E. Smith, Mohawk.
Christina B. Grozinger, Woodland.

NEW MEXICO

Helen B. Hickman, Hurley.

NORTH DAKOTA

Reuben P. Semrau, Balfour.

PENNSYLVANIA

Marion C. Hemmig, Elverson.
William Tyndall, Mount Joy.

TENNESSEE

Joe Sims, Lawrenceburg.
Onnie M. Hartsell, Limestone.
Everett M. Greer, Newport.
Wilbur Walker, Tiptonville.

TEXAS

Maggie P. Rhew, Anderson.
Chessell Gra, Brookshire.
William F. Hofmann, Carrollton.
Cornelius A. Ogden, Deweyville.
Corban J. Lewis, Eddy.
James S. Carter, Grand Saline.
Wright T. Pridgen, Grapeland.
Ira S. Koon, Hallsville.
Effie H. Briscoe, Hebronville.
Eva M. Reed, Hempstead.
John V. Lackey, Hico.
Lilburn C. Graham, Lancaster.
Nora C. Brite, Pleasanton.
Henry E. Cannon, Shelbyville.

WEST VIRGINIA

James O. Buskirk, Holden.
Guy E. McCutcheon, Reedy.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, *March 21, 1928*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Clerk, Hon. William Tyler Page.

The CLERK. The Clerk will read the following communication from the Speaker:

MARCH 21, 1928.

I hereby designate Hon. BERTRAND H. SNELL to act as Speaker pro tempore to-day.

NICHOLAS LONGWORTH.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] will please take the chair.

Mr. SNELL assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, Thou art love, and love resists definition. The undefinable God reveals Himself in a way which defies analysis. The sweetest passions of the human heart, multiplied by infinity, such is our blessed Heavenly Father. Hear us as we call. It is a solemn thing for us to enter this historic Chamber as servants of this wonderful Republic. Amid the stress and crash of change, unaffected by the losses of the past or the hopes of the future, here mighty men have raised their voices in fervent appeal; Thou wert with them. We thank Thee that the years make no change in Thy attitude; Thou art patient because Thou art eternal. As Thy hand was on the past it will be on the present. Our country, stored and armed with education, wealth, and opportunity, do Thou fortify us with courage and wisdom and with all their noble strength, so that it shall never be proclaimed that we are false to our great trust or untrue to our great obligation. O let it never be said that the wisdom of to-day will be the error of to-morrow. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 379. An act for the relief of William R. Boyce & Son;

S. 710. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, adjudicate, and render judgment in claims which the northwestern bands of Shoshone Indians may have against the United States;

S. 716. An act to exempt American Indians born in Canada from the operation of the immigration act of 1924;

S. 750. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1108. An act for the relief of Una May Arnold;

S. 1131. An act to encourage and promote the production of livestock in connection with irrigated lands in the States of Wyoming, Montana, and New Mexico;

S. 1145. An act to authorize an appropriation for roads on Indian reservations;

S. 1297. An act to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Alice E. Moore;

S. 1368. An act to extend the benefits of the employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Martha A. Hauch;

S. 1428. An act for the relief of R. Bluestein;

S. 1500. An act for the relief of James J. Welsh, Edward C. F. Webb, Francis A. Meyer, Mary S. Bennett, William McMullin, jr., Margaret McMullin, R. B. Carpenter, McCoy Yearsley, Edwards Yearsley, George H. Bennett, jr., Stewart L. Beck, William P. McConnell, Elizabeth J. Morrow, William B. Jester, Josephine A. Haggan, James H. S. Gam, Herbert Nicoll, Shallcross Bros., E. C. Buckson, Wilbert Rawley, R. Rickards, jr., Dredging Co.;

S. 1662. An act to change the boundaries of the Tule River Indian Reservation, Calif.;

S. 1796. An act for the creation of a national monument in Montana, to be known as Battle of the Bear's Paw;

S. 1848. An act for the relief of Frank Dixon;

S. 1899. An act for the relief of Clifford D. Ham, collector general of customs, administrator of Corinto Wharf, Republic of Nicaragua;

S. 2008. An act for the relief of the parents of Wyman Henry Beckstead;

S. 3500. An act for the relief of the city of Philadelphia;

S. 2084. An act for the purchase of land in the vicinity of Winnemucca, Nev., for an Indian colony, and for other purposes;

S. 2306. An act for the relief of William E. Thackrey;

S. 2369. An act to increase the effectiveness of expenditures for roads, bridges, and trails in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 2511. An act to change the name of St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum and amend the act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to incorporate St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum, in the District of Columbia,' approved February 25, 1831";

S. 2611. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to loan aeronautical equipment and material for purposes of research and experimentation;

S. 2733. To amend the military record of Joseph Cunningham;

S. 2764. An act for the relief of Nelle McConnell;

S. 2830. An act authorizing the adjustment of the boundaries of the Carson, Manzano, and Santa Fe National Forests in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes;

S. 3007. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions for a certain tract of land on the Mescalero Reservation, N. Mex.;

S. 3026. An act authorizing the construction of a fence along the east boundary of the Papago Indian Reservation, Ariz.;

S. 3128. An act to amend section 3 of the act approved April 12, 1926 (44 Stat. L. 239-240), with reference to suits involving Indian land titles among the Five Civilized Tribes;

S. 3343. An act for the relief of the Arapahoe and Cheyenne Indians, and for other purposes;

S. 3355. An act to authorize the cancellation of the balance due on a reimbursable agreement for the sale of cattle to certain Rosebud Indians;

S. 3506. An act for the relief of the owners of the British steamship *Larchgrove*;

S. 3507. An act for the relief of the Eagle Transport Co. (Ltd.) and the West of England Steamship Owners' Protection and Indemnity Association (Ltd.);

S. 3511. An act granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of Arkansas to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the White River at or near Cotter, Ark.;

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution tendering the thanks of Congress to Commander Albert Cushing Read, United States Navy, for his achievement in completing the first transatlantic airplane flight, and providing for his advancement on the list of commanders of the Navy; and

S. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution to amend subdivisions (b) and (e) of section 11 of the immigration act of 1924, as amended.